REPORT RESUMES

ED 016 860 08 VT 004 483

EVALUATION OF STUDENT TEACHING IN HOME ECONOMICS.

BY- NELSON, HELEN Y. GRITZMACHER, JOAN
STATE UNIV. OF N.Y., ITHACA

REPORT NUMBER BR-5-1333 PUB DATE MAY 67
GRANT OEG-1-6-000528-0663
EDRS PRICE MF-$0.50 HC-$3.36 82P.

DESCRIPTORS- *HOME ECONOMICS EDUCATION, *STUDENT TEACHING, *BEHAVIOR RATING SCALES, STUDENT TEACHERS, *TEACHER BEHAVIOR, *TEACHER EVALUATION,

CRITICAL INCIDENTS REFLECTING OUTSTANDINGLY EFFECTIVE BEHAVIOR IN STUDENT TEACHING OF HOME ECONOMICS WERE COLLECTED FROM COLLEGE SUPERVISORS, COOPERATING TEACHERS, AND STUDENT TEACHERS AND CATEGORIZED ACCORDING TO SPECIFIC BEHAVIORS, AND PROVIDED A BASIS FOR CONSTRUCTING A RATING SCALE FOR EVALUATING STUDENT TEACHING PERFORMANCE. THE CRITICAL BEHAVIORS WERE USED TO DESCRIBE QUALITY LEVELS ON A FIVE-POINT CONTINUUM OF 112 UNIDIMENSIONAL ITEMS. ANALYSIS OF THIS SCALE, RS-112, BY THE DARLINGTON PROCEDURE WITH STUDENT GRADES AS CRITERION MEASURES RESULTED IN A SCALE, RS-35, 35-ITEM WITH AT LEAST ONE ITEM IN EACH OF 10 MAJOR BEHAVIOR CATEGORIES. USE OF THE RS-35 GAVE A BETTER DISTRIBUTION OF RATINGS THAN RS-112. THE MAJORITY OF COOPERATING TEACHERS AND COLLEGE SUPERVISORS REPORTED USING A RATING SCALE. ABOUT HALF PREFERRED RS-35 TO RS-112 AND OVER HALF LIKED IT BETTER THAN THEIR PRESENT INSTRUMENT. MOST REPORTED A 20-MINUTE TESTING TIME. TWO-THIRDS SAID THEY WOULD USE THE RATING SCALE, IF AVAILABLE. MORE THAN HALF OF THE STUDENT TEACHERS FELT THAT IT PROVIDED AN IMPORTANT OBJECTIVE BASIS FOR LOOKING AT THEIR BEHAVIOR. RECOMMENDATIONS CONCERN (1) REFINING THE SCALE, (2) DIFFERENTIATING MORE CLEARLY BETWEEN LEVELS 3 AND 5, (3) USING THE FIVE ITEMS EMERGING FROM MULTIPLE REGRESSION ANALYSIS FOR A SHORTER RATING SCALE, (4) INCLUDING A PLACE FOR RATER COMMENTS ABOUT STUDENT TEACHER GROWTH, AND (5) USING THE SCALE AT THE MIDDLE AND CONCLUSION OF STUDENT TEACHING. BOTH SCALES, OPINIONNAIRES, CATEGORIES OF STUDENT BEHAVIOR, AND THE INFORMATION FORM FOR REPORTING CRITICAL INCIDENTS ARE INCLUDED. (FP)

DEC 7 1967

FINAL REPORT

5-1333

Project No. ~~ERD-528~~

Grant No. OEG-1-6-000528-0663

The Evaluation of Student Teaching in Home Economics

MAY 1967

U.S. Department of
Health, Education, and Welfare

OFFICE OF EDUCATION

BUREAU OF RESEARCH

VT004483

EVALUATION OF STUDENT TEACHING IN HOME ECONOMICS

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Project No. ERD-528
Grant No. OEG-1-6-000528-0663

Helen Y. Nelson and Joan Gritzmacher

May 1967

The research reported herein was performed pursuant to a grant with the Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their professional judgment in the conduct of the project. Points of view or opinions stated do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

New York State College of Home Economics

Cornell University

Ithaca, New York

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

INTRODUCTION 1
    Purpose and Nature of the Research 1
    Related Research 2

METHOD 4

RESULTS 6

DISCUSSION 12

CONCLUSIONS 17

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS 18

REFERENCES 22

GLOSSARY 25

APPENDIX 26

    Participation of Institutions A-1
    Letter to Participants B-1
    Sample Critical Incident C-1
    Sample Analysis, Critical Incident D-1
    Behavior Categories E-1
    Rating Scale: RS-112 .... F-1
    Rating Scale: RS-35 .... G-1
    Opinionnaire: Teacher-Supervisor Form H-1
    Opinionnaire: Student Teacher Form I-1
    Information to Accompany Rating Scale in Future Use J-1

INTRODUCTION

The student teaching experience affords the opportunity to develop competencies inherent in effective teaching. The professional supervision of student teachers is an attempt to give direction to this experience. Evaluation of student teacher performance, i.e. the student teaching grade, provides an index of effective teaching and, to this extent, evaluation can be used to clarify objectives and improve role competency. A valid and reliable evaluation device contributes to the efficacy of assessment and therefore to the fulfilment of student teaching goals. Current literature reveals that there is a dearth of such instruments and that many educators are dissatisfied with present patterns of evaluation of student teaching.

Purpose and Nature of the Research

In an attempt to facilitate the process of student teacher evaluation in home economics, a study was designed to determine by means of the critical incident technique the performances contributing to effective and ineffective student teaching behavior, and to construct a rating scale to evaluate those performances. The critical incident technique employs collected reports of effective and ineffective behavioral patterns as they relate to the aim of the activity being analyzed. The present study used this means to identify student teacher behaviors related to and reflexive in effective or ineffective teaching. Based on the categorized incidents, descriptions of unidimensional student teacher behavior were written and assembled in rating scale form. It was expected that the rating scale would thus describe student teacher behaviors which are significant in the performance of the student teacher.

Following independent use of the rating scale by cooperating teachers, student teachers and college supervisors, analysis of the data was executed using the student teaching grade as the criterion measure of student teaching performance. The theoretical work of Thorndike (30) and the implementation of this by Darlington (14) provided the base for the test analysis. Regression analysis predicting the student teaching grade from the rating scale items was performed.

A second stage rating scale composed of those items from the preliminary scale statistically determined to be the most important indicators of student teaching performance, was formulated and administered to a second sample for purposes of cross validation. This instrument was tested and its reliability and usefulness as an evaluative device in the student teaching experience were assessed. The reliability of the instrument was determined by inter rater, split-half, and item discrimination methods. The usefulness of the rating scale was investigated through administration of two opinionnaires, one designed for student teachers, and one for cooperating teachers and college supervisors.

The study was limited to evaluation of student teachers in home economics, and evaluation was restricted to the use of a rating scale at the end of the student teaching experience. Operational definitions of terms used in this report may be found in the glossary.

Related Research

In reviewing literature relevant to the topic of this study, five areas were covered: (1) evaluation of student teaching in home economics, (2) evaluation of student teaching in general, (3) teacher effectiveness, (4) the critical incident technique, and (5) rating scales.

Student Teaching in Home Economics. Studies of evaluation of student teaching in home economics have centered on surveying practices and instruments used to assess the effectiveness of student teaching (10) and the effect of such upon the student teacher (27), construction of scales based on the opinions of qualified teacher educators or cooperating teachers as to the aspects of teaching necessary to measure (33), and evaluation of the performance of instruments (15).

Student Teaching. In the literature on student teaching in general, there is considerable evidence of dissatisfaction with methods of evaluation (28; 11) and some attention to identification of needs in the area of evaluation (21). Analyses of existing rating scales for the evaluation of student teaching have been carried out (5; 34). Personality characteristics of inferior and superior student teachers were delineated (32; 29; 23). Student teachers were evaluated in terms of strengths and weaknesses (26), and a study was conducted inquiring as to what school administrators desired to know about a prospective teacher employee (25).

Teacher Effectiveness. In reviewing literature on teacher effectiveness three basic approaches to its measurement were identified: evaluation of pupil growth, evaluation of teacher qualities thought to influence the teaching-learning process, and appraisal of the teaching process. The measurement of teacher effectiveness has been plagued by the problem of validity of the criterion of teaching effectiveness. Some researchers feel that consensus of authorities in the field is the best procedure (3) while others are investigating objective measures (2; 13). As yet, none of the objective means seems to have value for appraisal of student teaching. Measurement of teacher qualities thought to influence the teaching-learning process has usually taken the form of a rating scale formulated by teacher educators (1; 35; 19). Appraisal of the teaching process has involved measurement of classroom behavior quantitatively and by rating devices (6; 22). The teaching process seems most readily evaluated through the analysis of teaching behavior since behaviors can be observed and personality as it enters behavior can also be assessed (22; 8). Results of these studies in general have yielded inconclusive evidence about teacher effectiveness.

Critical Incident Technique. The critical incident technique involves the identification of behaviors that are either outstandingly effective or ineffective as the individual performs the job under scrutiny. This methodology has been used extensively in the analysis of many jobs and provides information regarding the requirements of a position (16). Although Flanagan suggested the technique requires only simple judgments on the part of the qualified observer, and thus is easy to use, Mayhew (20) pointed to some difficulties in using the critical incident technique. Advantages of this method are its provision of actual materials for use, and valid bases for construction of evaluation instruments. A study by Blank (9) employed the critical incident technique to determine characteristics of effective and ineffective teaching of physical education instructors.

Rating Scales. The rating scale classified as graphic was used in this study. Such a scale consists of a continuum presented to the subject with preassigned bench marks, to be marked according to the rating deemed most accurate. This form of rating scale is felt to be simple and easy to administer, interesting and quick to work with (17). Criticism of rating scales have included lack of satisfactory validity criteria, subjectivity, and difficulty of establishing the validity of the totel rating. Use of critical incident material based on student teacher's observed behavior took care of the validity criticism; subjectivity was handled by attempting to define as precisely as possible the dimension of the student teaching experience to be rated; validity of the total rating was investigated by correlating the summed scale scores with student teaching grade. In that a rating scale is geared to standardize both what is observed and how it is appraised, it is felt that this is the most useful instrument for securing a quantitative appraisal of student teaching (4).

Because student teaching is asserted to be the most important experience in teacher preparation, the scarcity of literature on the evaluation of student teaching was unexpected. The problem of evaluating student teacher performance is complicated by the fact that researchers have not reached definitive conclusions about teacher effectiveness. Rating scales appear to be the best method of evaluating student teachers' performance, and the critical incident technique seems to hold promise for indicating the behaviors of the student teacher that should be evaluated in this manner.

METHOD

The major problem with which this study was concerned was the construction of a rating scale to serve as a summary evaluation of home economics student teachers' performance in student teaching. Flanagan's critical incident technique was utilized as the means by which data on actual effective and ineffective behaviors of student teachers were secured and thereafter utilized as a valid base for the construction of the scale.

Sample and First Data Collection. Colleges and universities preparing home economics teachers in New York State, the New England States, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Ohio, Indiana, Tennessee, Kentucky, and West Virginia were asked to cooperate in this research. (See appendix for list of participating institutions and letter to participants.) Cooperating teachers, college supervisors and student teachers of 20 institutions participated in the collection of critical incidents during May 1965, and from October 1965 through February 1966. (Materials used in the collection of critical incidents are appended.)

Analysis of Critical Incidents. All critical incidents received were analyzed to separate out single specific behaviors; the behaviors were then classified into ten major categories that emerged as the incidents were studied. A randomly selected 15 percent of the incidents were submitted to a panel of five home economics teacher educators who classified them according to the ten categories. The majority agreement of the consultants was used as the accepted categorization for the incidents reviewed. (The appendix contains a list of the categories of student teacher behavior derived from the critical incidents and an example of the analysis of an incident.)

Construction, Use and Analysis of Preliminary Rating Scale. Following analysis and categorization, the specific behaviors were utilized in the construction of a rating scale. Ineffective behaviors reported formed the level one description on the scale, and the effective behaviors reported were utilized in the level five description whenever possible. The level three descriptions were written so as to strike a middle of the road position between levels one and five. Based on the critical incident data received, 112 rating scale dimensions emerged to form the first stage rating scale - hereafter referred to as RS-112. Content validity is based on the 550 critical incidents of student teachers' behaviors. Search was made for instruments to establish concurrent validity of rating scale items but satisfactory instruments were found not to be available.

Twenty institutions (not the identical 20 furnishing critical incidents) collected data from the use of the first-stage rating scale by cooperating teachers, college supervisors and student teachers. Reliability of RS-112 based on 399 scales was determined in three ways: (1) computation of the correlation of all matching college supervisor-cooperating teacher ratings (N=125 pairs), i.e., inter-rater reliability, (2) correlation of the sum of the even scores with the sum of the odd scores, i.e., split-half reliability of the grader group (N=194 persons responsible for grading student teachers) and (3) computation of the index of discriminating power of each of the items.

The Pearson product moment correlation was chosen for those analyses involving correlations. Rho was considered and discarded. The basis for this decision was that it was easier to make the assumption that the intervals in the data (rating scale and student teaching grades) were equally spaced than that the distance between ranks was equal. The median correlation was used to compare groups of correlations with each other.

The student teaching grade was used as a criterion measure of success in student teaching. Standardization of student teaching grades was implemented by a z-score conversion employing mean scores on the rating scale and mean student teaching grades for each institution and the total sample.

Production, Use and Analysis of Second Stage Rating Scale. In order to ascertain the items identifying those teacher behaviors most predictive of student teaching success, the second stage rating scale was constructed. Darlington's method (14) based on the work of Thorndike (30) was utilized to reduce the number of items in RS-112 to the "best" predictors of the criterion. The Darlington method yields information about the ability of an item to increase the validity of a test as determined by item validity and item-test correlation. The procedure involves (1) selecting the most valid items to form the basic test, (2) measuring the potential of each item in the pool to increase the validity of the basic test, and (3) adding several items with the highest potential to determine if in fact they do increase the validity of the test. The validity coefficient is a multiple correlation of the items and the criterion. The Darlington method yeilds high validity coefficients upon cross validation and with less shrinkage of items than is usual for the method of multiple regression analysis. By nature of its function, multiple regression analysis picks the "best" items from a highly correlated pool, and thereby disregards other highly inter-correlated items in the pool. With the Darlington method, those other highly inter-correlated items in the pool still have a chance of coming into the test and contributing something to its validity. Although this method was the chief analysis of the study, a regression analysis was also executed. Thirty-five items emerged from the Darlington analysis; four additional items, as well as 10 contained in the 35 items above, came from the regression analysis as significant for the evaluation of student teaching in home economics. These constituted the revised or second-stage rating scale.

Data from administration of the second-stage rating scale in participating institutions were analyzed using the procedure followed for RS-112 with the exception of the Darlington and multiple regression analyses. The final form of the Darlington program for RS-112 (the 35 items as ordered by the partial correlation and validity programs) was used in the analysis of the second stage rating scale, and the 14 items emerging from regression analysis were utilized in the analysis of the second stage rating scale. The determination of the significance of the difference of correlations obtained with RS-112 data and those of RS-35 data was facilitated by use of Fisher's z-test. In addition the scores on the 35 items were summed and the sum was correlated with the student teaching grade.

Two opinionnaires were formulated, one to determine feelings of student teachers and the other the feelings of cooperating teachers and college supervisors toward the rating scale. The opinions desired related to comparison with evaluation devices presently in use, and time required to fill out the instrument. (See appendix for copies of opinionnaires.)

RESULTS

Critical Incidents. Of the 563 critical incidents collected, 550 were usable. Nearly half were reported by cooperating teachers, student teachers submitted about one-third, and college supervisors about one-fifth. Student teachers reported approximately equal numbers of effective and ineffective incidents, while both cooperating teachers and college supervisors contributed more ineffective than effective incidents; slightly less than half of the reports in the total sample were made of effective behavior.

Study of the 550 incidents revealed 958 specific behaviors. Classification according to behavioral areas of a randomly selected 15 per cent of the incidents by a panel of home economics teacher educators was largely in agreement with the authors' classifications of specific behaviors.

First Stage Rating Scales. The critical behaviors formed the basis for construction of a rating scale for evaluation of student teachers in home economics, initially consisting of 112 items. Five hundred, ninety-two rating scales were distributed for administration at the end of the student teaching period. (The Appendix contains a copy of RS-112 with inter-rater reliability, correlation with student teaching grade, and index of discrimination figures for each item noted in the margins.) Of the 405 returned, 399 (68% of rating scales sent) were usable. Student teachers completed 124 of these, cooperating teachers 139, and college supervisors completed 136. Studentteachers tended to rate themselves higher than their cooperating teachers and college supervisors rated them. Cooperating teachers made more use of all levels of the rating scale than did either college supervisors or student teachers. The upper end of the instrument received greatest usage with 35 per cent in each of the top two categories (4 and 5). Approximately 20 per cent of all responses were found in level 3. About 5 per cent of the ratings were either "no observation" or "no answer".

Reliability of the 112 item instrument was ascertained by inter-rater, split-half and item discrimination methods. Inter-rater reliability on the rating scale was computed on data from 125 cases of matching college supervisor and cooperating teacher. The coefficient of reliability for all variables was .42, but when stepped-up by the Spearman Brown prophecy formula, rose to .59. The split-half method of determining internal consistency was computed on 194 graders' data; the coefficient was .97. When stepped-up by the Spearman Brown prophecy formula, this correlation became .98. Cross validation was done by dividing the entire group alternately in half. The cross validation split-half reliability for Graders A (N=97) was .96 and for Graders B (N=97) was .96. The cross validation shows that the coefficient of split-half reliability can be accepted with confidence.

The internal consistency of the first stage rating scale was also tested by the use of the Index of Discrimination. The statistic showed the amount of differentiation of the 112 ratings between the high and low 27 percent of the student teachers as determined by student teaching grade when the grader data (N=194) were analyzed. The mode for the indices of discrimination (71 percent) fell in the .20 to .29 range, low but acceptable. There were 21 items with indices below .20 putting them in the questionable class. Despite the generally low discrimination values, all these indices were positive.

The major analysis of RS-112 utilized the Darlington procedure to determine the items significant for the evaluation of student teaching in home economics. This analysis used with student grades adjusted on the basis of mean ratings of institution in which they occurred resulted in a 35 item scale having a validity coefficient (multiple correlation with criterion) of .85. The same procedure using student teacher grades as given, yielded a validity coefficient of .83. The items identified with one asterisk on the 112 item rating scale in the appendix are the 35 items resulting from the Darlington analysis.

A stepwise multiple regression analysis was also carried out on RS-112. A 14 item scale with a multiple correlation of .87 resulted. All of the 14 items had F levels significant at .01. Ten of these items had also been derived in the Darlington analysis. The items on the appended 112 item scale marked with two asterisks were those selected by the regression analysis.

Second Stage Rating Scale. Second stage rating scales (389) were distributed (to be used with new student teachers even though some of the same institutions participated). By the cut-off deadline, 276 (71 percent) of these had been completed and returned. (The Appendix contains a copy of RS-35 with inter-rater reliability, correlation with student teaching grade and index of discrimination figures for each item noted in the margins.) Of the total, 91 were completed by student teachers, 99 by cooperating teachers and 86 by college supervisors. Again the upper levels were used more heavily, with 28 percent of the ratings falling at the 5 level, 35 percent at 4 level and 26 percent at level 3. Although levels 1 and 2 were still not used extensively, a better balance of levels 3, 4 and 5 was achieved with the second stage rating scale.

Reliability of the second stage rating scale was determined by inter-rater, split-half, and item discrimination methods. Correlation of 61 matching cases of college supervisor-cooperating teacher data yielded a coefficient of .48, as compared with the inter-rater reliability correlation coefficient of .38 for RS-112. When the inter-rater correlation of .48 for RS-35 was stepped-up by use of the Spearman-Brown prophecy formula, the coefficient rose to .65 vs. the stepped-up coefficient of .59 for RS-112. However, the differences between these correlations were not statistically significant when Fisher's z-test was applied. The inter-rater reliability coefficients for each of the items in RS-35 are noted on the scale appended.

Execution of split-half reliability yielded a coefficient of .93 when carried out on the 122 graders' data. The split-half coefficient for RS-112 was .97. When Fisher's z-test was applied to determine the significance of the difference, the results were found to be significant at the one percent level. When the split half reliability coefficient of RS-35 was stepped-up with the Spearman-Brown formula, the coefficient became .96 which was still significantly different at the one percent level from the stepped-up coefficient of .98 resulting from RS-112.

Cross validation of RS-35 reliability was carried out by dividing the grader group alternately in half. The coefficient for Graders AA (N=61) was .88 and that for Graders BB (N=61) was .93. Utilizing Fisher's z-test, comparison of split-half reliability coefficients for Graders AA and Graders BB with all Graders on RS-35 data yielded non-significant differences from the overall split-half reliability correlation of .93. The internal cross validation of RS-35 grader data indicate that the split-half reliability coefficient can be accepted with confidence.

The Index of Discrimination was computed for the 35 items in the second stage rating scale plus the additional 4 from the regression analysis using the high and low 27 percent of the student teachers as determined by student teaching grade. The mode for the cross validation data lay in the same .20 - .29 range as with RS-112, but with RS-35, 60 percent of the indices were in the .20 - .29 range whereas with RS-112, 71 percent were in that range. The .30 - .39 range now held 37 percent of the indices as compared with RS-112 where only 10 percent of the indices were in that category. In RS-35 only one item (3 percent) had an index below .20 and thus was questionable compared with 21 items (19 percent) on RS-112. The findings show that the items on RS-35 had better discriminating power than those on RS-112. As with the RS-112 data, all discrimination indices, although low, were positive.

The comparison of the student teacher's perception of herself with ratings of college supervisors and of cooperating teachers for RS-35 data yielded correlations of .26 (N=60 matching pairs) and .21 (N=70 matching pairs) respectively. The comparable figures for RS-112 were .22 and .29; there was no significant difference between the correlations resulting from the two data collections.

The validity coefficient (multiple correlation with student teaching grade) resulting from resubmitting the Darlington order and program on the 35 item second stage rating scale data was .78. This was not significantly different from that of .85 obtained with RS-112 data. An interesting facet of this analysis was that the validity coefficient built to .84 with 14 items. Table 1 presents the validity coefficients for each item in RS-35.

TABLE 1. VALIDITY COEFFICIENTS OF ITEMS IN RS-35 IN ORDER DETERMINED BY ANALYSIS OF RS-112

Order Number	Item Number	Validity Coefficient
1	20	.67
2	31	.73
3	14	.80
4	17	.81
5	10	.81
6	19	.81
7	22	.83
8	12	.82
9	18	.84
10	15	.84
11	27	.84
12	7	.84
13	21	.84
14	33	.84
15	8	.84
16	13	.83
17	24	.83
18	25	.82
19	26	.81
20	34	.79
21	5	.77
22	4	.76
23	1	.78
24	2	.78
25	32	.79
26	28	.81
27	11	.81
28	9	.79
29	6	.80
30	23	.81
31	29	.81
32	35	.81
33	3	.80
34	16	.79
35	30	.78

Stepwise multiple regression analysis using the 14 items that were derived from the multiple regression analysis of RS-112 was carried out. Five items emerged with a multiple correlation of .85. There was no significant difference between the multiple R .89 obtained for fourteen items from RS-112 data and the .85 obtained from the five items from RS-35 data.

An index of validity was secured by correlating the summed scale scores for RS-35 with the adjusted and with the unadjusted student teaching grades. The resultant correlations were .84 for the adjusted grade and .79 for the unadjusted student teaching grade.

Opinionnaire Data. Sixty percent of the college supervisors and approximately half of the cooperating teachers reported use of a rating scale as the present instrument for measuring a student teacher's performance. Some of these used descriptive categories; others used descriptive adjectives as superior, good, poor.

When asked whether their present instrument or RS-35 provided a better basis for grading the student teacher, about half of the college supervisors and cooperating teachers felt that RS-35 was superior. Approximately a third of the cooperating teachers and somewhat more than a third of the college supervisors thought that both instruments provided the same basis.

About a fourth of the cooperating teachers and one third of the college supervisors felt that RS-35 took less time to complete than the rating scale they were presently using. Approximately half felt that RS-35 and the presently used scale took about the same length of time to complete, and slightly more than a fifth of the cooperating teachers and slightly less than a seventh of the college supervisors thought the scale they were presently using required less time to complete. The majority of respondents had no objection to the amount of time required to fill out the instrument and noted that 11-20 minutes was enough.

In general both cooperating teachers and college supervisors felt RS-35 and their own scales were equally easy to use. Only one fourth of the cooperating teachers and a fifth of the college supervisors thought that their own rating scale was easier to use.

When pressed to make the decision as to which instrument they thought better - all things considered - more than half the college supervisors and cooperating teachers said RS-35 was better. However, slightly more than a third of both college supervisors and cooperating teachers felt that the scale they were using and RS-35 were of the same quality.

Approximately two-thirds of the cooperating teachers and college supervisors stated that if RS-35 were available for their continued use, they would use it. Approximately one fourth said they would use RS-35 but made some qualification.

Student opinionnaire data indicated that the student teachers did not object to the length of time required to fill out the rating scale - again for the majority, the time required was 11-20 minutes. When asked to check their feelings about using RS-35, more than half of the student teacher responses pointed up the positive and objective basis for looking at performance. About one fifth of the responses indicated they felt that it was professionally important, and one fifth of the responses centered on the quickness with which the scale could be completed. Very few student responses were negative; those that were indicated a dislike for rating self on any instrument.

DISCUSSION

As the sample in this study was limited to those institutions that agreed to participate, the results can only be applied to that group. However, it is felt that a diversity of colleges and universities participated in the study and that the rating scale would yield similar results with other samples.

Critical Incidents. It was noted that the cooperating teacher reported the most critical incidents, nearly one half of those reported. The student teachers submitted somewhat less than one third and the college supervisors contributed somewhat less than one fifth. The fact that cooperating teachers contributed the most critical incidents can probably be attributed to their being on the job with the student teachers each day and to their continual observation of student teachers' behavior. The college supervisors contributed fewest critical incidents, very likely due to her more limited contact with the student teacher during the student teaching experience.

For the total sample, slightly less than half of the reports were made of effective behaviors. Perhaps more ineffective behaviors were reported because one has more of a tendency to note and report ineffectiveness. This finding however was not true for student teachers who reported an equal number of outstandingly effective and ineffective behaviors.

On categorizing the critical incidents the classification with the most number of incidents reported was found to be "Adaptation to Students' Level". Nearly a tenth of the total number of incidents fell in this category. Of these 88 critical behaviors, about three-fourths indicated ineffective behavior. These data indicate a need for better acquainting the student teachers with the student they will teach.

Three other categories in the top ten frequency also contained a greater number of ineffective than effective behaviors. "Teacher Direction and Supervision" ranked third; there was a preponderance of five to one ineffective incidents. "Accuracy and Conceptual Development of Subject Matter" also included a majority of ineffective behaviors reported, as did "Organization of Time: Classroom".

Three categories included approximately equal numbers of effective and ineffective behaviors reported. These categories were, "Use of Techniques and Methods", "Ability to Obtain Student Involvement", and "Classroom Control".

Three categories included reports of more effective than ineffective behaiors. These categories were: "Behavior in Emergency or Unexpected Situations". "Use of Motivation/Interest Approach", and "Personal Qualities".

First Stage Rating Scale. In the distribution of ratings on RS-112 the greatest percentage for "no answer" and "no observation" cells was reported by the college supervisor. This was probably due to the fact that the college supervisor visited the student teacher only occasionally and did not, therefore, have enough information to make some of the ratings. The cooperating teacher reported the next largest number of "no answer" and "no observation" reports, and the student teacher the least. This should be expected as the student teacher was rating herself, and therefore she would be in possession of more information about her performance as she perceived it.

The greatest percentage of missing observations was in the item describing rapport with parents. This finding may be due to the lack of contact of student teachers with parents. Other missing observations were in the categories dealing with performance in supervision and classroom control, care of the department, rapport with faculty, extra curricular activities, and professional attitude and judgment. The nature of these categories may account for difficulty in rating.

The student teacher tended to rate herself higher than did the cooperating teacher or the college supervisor. Perhaps student teachers were disposed to be generous in their self appraisals as they had survived three or more years of academic work and any screening of candidates for student teaching. If they viewed academic achievement and student teaching performance as requiring similar effort, the halo effect would carry over.

In the item analysis of RS-112 data the mode for the indices of discrimination lay in the .20 - .29 range, low but acceptable. Possibly the reason for low discrimination is that many incompetent prospective teachers are diverted into other areas before the student teaching experience. Secondly, perhaps student teachers tend to be a homogeneous group. There was not much range in student teaching grades between the high and low groups.

The correlation of college supervisor-student teacher ratings by institution ranged from -.06 to .49, averaging .22, indicating that student teachers viewed their performance differently from the college supervisors. The averaged correlation of cooperating teachers and student teachers ratings yielded a coefficient of .29. The figure indicated a slightly better agreement of cooperating teacher and student teacher than of college supervisor and student teacher.

Second Stage Rating Scale. Analysis and refinement of RS-112 yielded the second stage rating scale, RS-35 with at least one item in each of the ten major behavior categories. Again the college supervisors reported the greatest number of "no answer" and "no observation". The cooperating teacher had submitted a lesser percentage and the student teacher the least. This was the same trend as had been noted on the RS-112 data. The percentage for "no observation" and "no answer" was considerably lower with the second rating scale for all three groups. This finding can probably be attributed to the statistical procedure which culled out the presumably less important and less frequently seen behaviors.

The student teacher still tended to rate herself higher than did the cooperating teacher or college supervisor. With the RS-35 analysis it was impossible to determine whether cooperating teachers or college supervisors made more use of all levels on the rating scale as the percentage for these two groups was very similar; whereas in RS-112 the cooperating teachers made most use of all levels. The selection of items on RS-35 is probably responsible for this change.

Comparisons of RS-35 Items with Qualities of "Good" Teachers as Reported in the Literature. Some characteristics of "good" teachers as reported in the literature reviewed for this study emerged in the critical incidents, survived the eliminating due to statistical analysis of RS-112, and appear in the final version of the rating scale.

Teacher enthusiasm appeared in the second stage rating scale. Mastin (19) studied teacher enthusiasm and found that students learned more when the teacher was enthusiastic than when she was not. Enthusiasm was also one of the qualities that 44 percent of school administrators wanted in a prospective employee as researched by Rhodes and Peckham (25). Almy and Sorenson (1) incorporated this characteristic in their rating scale for teachers; they had found enthusiasm to be one of the traits contributed most frequently by competent educators as an important teacher attribute. Peronto (24) analyzed performance records of social studies teachers and found that the "good" ones were enthusiastic.

Patience, described in one item, was found mentioned in literature reviewed only once. It was among traits contributed most frequently by competent educators and therefore, included in the Almy-Sorenson Rating Scale for Teachers (1).

Peronto (24) mentioned better speaking voice as differentiating the "good" from the "poor" teachers he studied. The item describing pronunciation and use of expressions, and the item about pitch of voice might be considered parts of Peronto's "better speaking voice" category. When Barr (7) summarized studies of teaching efficiency, he also included skill in speech.

Among the findings of Debernardi (11) and Schultz and Ohlsen (26)about "good" teachers was the ability to plan and organize work. Rhodes and Peckham (25) stated that school administrators looked for a prospective teacher who had ability to plan and motivate lessons. Perhaps the planning ability mentioned by these investigators was similar to some of the behaviors mentioned in several RS-35 items which related to lesson planning.

Barr's (7) reference to the ten skills of the "good" teacher contained one skill relating to "setting and defining goals" which was described by one of RS-35's items.

Skill in planning or asking questions was evaluated by two items. This ability was mentioned in the literature by Barr (6) and Peronto (24).

Choosing learning experiences was a skill of the "good" teacher according to Barr (7). This was described by three items in RS-35.

The planning of evaluative procedures was the subject of one item and was supported in the literature as being important for teaching effectiveness by Barr (7).

A number of investigators mentioned ability to stimulate interest or to motivate pupils. Among them were Barr (6; 7), Schultz and Ohlsen (26), and Rhodes and Peckham (25). The motivation factor was assessed by two items.

Alertness to student needs, measured by another item, was delineated by Barr (7) as an important skill of the teacher, and by Debernardi (11).

The importance of knowledge and choice of subject matter for good teaching was stated by Barr (6), Barr and Emans (31), Debernardi (11), and Peronto (24). Several items assessed some of the behaviors in this area.

Instructional skill as mentioned by Barr (7) and Barr and Emans (31) and professional competence as reported by Rhodes and Peckham (25) as attributes of "good" teachers were broad terms, and numerous items or perhaps most items might be construed as fitting under these categories.

Involving pupils in classroom activities as mentioned by Schultz and Ohlsen (26) was measured by one item in RS-35.

Only one item measured classroom control; this teacher behavior was found to be one of the 10 most frequently incorporated in teacher rating scales according to Barr and Emans (31), and was mentioned by Debernardi (11).

Care of the department was the subject of one item. Barr and Emans (31) noted that this was one of the categories frequently found in teacher rating scales.

Pupil-teacher rapport characterized the "good" teacher as indicated by Barr (7), Debernardi (11), Rhodes and Peckham (25) and Hearn (11) if rapport can be equated with interest in pupils. Two rating scale items measured teacher-pupil rapport.

Professional attitude was assessed by an item in RS-35 and was said to be important by Debernardi (11). It was also found as one of the ten most frequently described categories in teacher rating scales as analyzed by Barr and Emans (31).

Ideas in the rating scale items found to be significant for the evaluation of effectiveness in student teaching that were not supported by the literature reviewed included: provision of meaningful experiences and change of pace; making available necessary and appropriate materials; provision of experiences to facilitate transfer of learning; control of movement of lesson; ability to assume full class load; preparation of assignments for students without work; reliance on cooperating teacher; assistance and participation in extra curricular activities.

Some characteristics of "good" teachers were reported in the literature but did not appear in the second stage rating scale. Barr (6) and Hearn (11) thought provision for individual differences an important characteristic of the "good" teacher. Although this behavior did not emerge in the second stage rating scale, the idea appeared in three items of the original instrument.

Barr (6) described a "good" teacher as requiring a notebook and outside reading. The keeping of a notebook tends to be a bit passé at present, and the concept of outside reading appeared in no critical incidents in this study.

The objective teacher characteristic of standing most of the period as noted by Barr (6) did not appear in any of the present research.

The concept of attractiveness or appearance was mentioned by Charters and Waples (12) and Barr and Emans (31). The study by Charters and Waples concentrated on such characteristics as carefulness, health, openmindedness, promptness, refinement, and thrift. Barr and Emans (31) also listed health. Since these are teacher characteristics and not behaviors involved in the teaching process, the concepts did not emerge in the present study.

Personal habits, a rather nebulous designation, was enumerated by Barr and Emans (31) as a characteristic of a "good" teacher. Since it is difficult to know what these two men had in mind, it is impossible to seek comparisons in this research.

Hatcher (18) found that "good" teachers cooperated extensively with other departments and gained the cooperation of other faculty members in their programs. While this idea did not emerge in the second stage rating scale, it appeared in the initial set of items.

Knowledge of mental hygiene was listed as an important characteristic of the "good" teacher by Peronto (24). This teacher characteristic, not behavior, was not enumerated in the present research.

CONCLUSIONS

This study has demonstrated that a valid, reliable and useful rating scale has been constructed for the evaluation of student teaching in home economics. Critical incidents collected from a diverse sample of cooperating teachers, college supervisors, and student teachers provided an empirical base for construction of the rating scale.

Administration and analysis of a second stage rating scale, RS-35, yielded almost completely satisfactory cross validation of results of RS-112, the first rating scale constructed. The overall split-half figures for the two scales were in the 90's indicating a high degree of consistency with which any participant rated.

Item discrimination indices for RS-35 were better than those for RS-112, but the mode for both instruments was the .20 to .29 range. Perhaps the discrimination indices were low because potentially low student teachers were directed out of the program before the student teaching experience.

Inter-rater reliability coefficients were not significantly different for RS-35 and RS-112. Although one would like to see agreement higher, .59 and .65 are not unacceptable figures.

The second stage scale was said to require generally less than twenty minutes to complete. Approximately two thirds of cooperating teachers and college supervisors said that they would use the scale if it were available for continued use. Approximately one fourth made some qualifications about continued use of the scale.

The method followed in the development of the scale certainly has merit and could beneficially be adopted by rating scale constructors in other fields and for other purposes.

The diverse types and geographical locations of institutions in the sample, and satisfactory cross validation suggest the findings of the study would probably apply to the evaluation of most home economics student teachers.

SUMMARY

The primary concern of this study was the construction of a rating scale for the evaluation of student teaching in home economics, in particular those aspects that are critical in student teaching performance. The problem was approached by means of the critical incident technique. Five hundred and fifty usable reports of outstandingly effective or ineffective student teacher behaviors (958 critical behaviors) were collected from college supervisors, cooperating teachers and student teachers; these were categorized according to specific behaviors, and a randomly selected 15 percent of the data submitted to a panel of home economics teacher educators to check agreement in classification. The researchers and the panel were in agreement 66 percent of the time.

The critical behaviors provided a valid base for a rating scale; they were used to describe levels of quality on a five point continuum of 112 unidimensional items. Tested in the field by a self selected sample, percentage distribution of 399 ratings showed 70 percent in levels 4 and 5. Cooperating teachers made the greatest use of all levels. Student teachers tended to rate themselves higher than either cooperating teachers or college supervisors rated them.

Reliability of the instrument was tested by inter-rater, split-half, and item discrimination methods. The inter-rater correlation stepped-up by use of the Spearman-Brown prophecy formula was .59 for 125 matching college supervisor-cooperating teacher pairs. The stepped-up split-half reliability coefficient was .98 for 194 graders - those responsible for giving the student teaching grade. Item discrimination analysis showed a modal response or 71 percent of the indices in the .20 to .29 category - low but acceptable.

The major analysis of the first stage rating scale was the Darlington program which involved partial correlations and validity coefficients (multiple correlation with the criterion, student teaching grade). The grader data (N=194) had student teaching grades adjusted on the basis of mean ratings of the institution in which they occurred as compared with the overall mean ratings, to take care of the variance of grades among institutions. The resulting validity coefficient was .85 for 35 items. When the Darlington program was run with the 35 items and the student teaching grades as given, the resulting coefficient was .83.

A stepwise multiple regression analysis was carried out which yielded fourteen significant items with a multiple R of .87. Ten of these items had appeared from the Darlington analysis; the four not so generated were included with the 35 items in order to examine their cross validation performance.

The second stage rating scales and opinionnaires were administered to a self selected and independent sample. By the deadline for data collection, 276 rating scales had been returned. The same analysis as delineated for RS-112 was carried out. The difference between correlation coefficients was tested using Fisher's z.

The greatest percentage of ratings fell in level 4 while levels 3 and 5 tended to be almost equal, indicating RS-35 had a better distribution of ratings than RS-112. As with RS-112, student teachers tended to rate themselves higher than either cooperating teachers or college supervisors rated them. With RS-35 no one group could be said to have made use of all scale levels.

The stepped-up inter-rater coefficient for RS-35 was .65, not significantly different from the .59 of RS-112. The stepped-up split-half reliability correlation was .96 which was significantly different at the one percent level from .98 for RS-112. However, the internal cross validation of RS-35 split-half correlation yielded results not significantly different from those of the whole group. Item discrimination was better than that found for RS-112, but the mode was still in the .20 to .29 range.

Running the Darlington program on RS-35 data yielded a validity coefficient of .78 which was not significantly different from the figure of .85 for RS-112. However, the figure of .73 which resulted from use of the unadjusted student teaching grades was significantly different at the five percent level from .83 for RS-112.

When the 14 items generated from the stepwise regression analysis of RS-112 were used in the analysis of RS-35, five of these items emerged with a multiple correlation of .85 as compared to .87 with the [illegible] items in RS-112 analysis.

An index of validity was secured by correlating the summed scale scores for RS-35 with the adjusted student teaching grade which yielded a correlation of .84. When the same procedure was followed with the unadjusted student teaching grades, the correlation was .79.

The majority of cooperating teachers and college supervisors reported use of a rating scale to evaluate student teaching. About half of the supervisors and cooperating teachers felt that RS-35 provided a better basis for grading and somewhat more than half thought it had better all around qualities than their presently used instrument. Most who used the scale found that it took no longer than twenty minutes to complete; they did not object to the time required for its use. When queried about continued use of the rating scale if it were available, approximately two thirds of cooperating teachers and college supervisors said they would use it, and approximately one fourth gave their qualified assent. More than half the student teachers considered that the objective basis RS-35 provided for looking at their behavior was important. Approximately a fifth thought it professionally important, and another 20 percent stressed the ease and quickness with which RS-35 can be used. Negative student teacher reactions were very few.

Recommendations

Since RS-35 performed quite satisfactorily, it deserves further refinement and use. If a short rating scale is desired, for an almost equivalent correlation with student teaching grade, the five items emerging from the multiple regression analysis are recommended. (See items 14, 28, 31, 35, 39 in RS-35, appended.)

Should anyone be interested in a further refinement, the addition of a descriptive level between three and five would be beneficial since the upper end of the scale received extensive use. Possibly the rating system could be changed to one through ten, to enable the raters to differentiate more at the top of the scale. This would not be recommended, however, unless the additional descriptive level suggested were added.

A place should be made on the rating scale for comments by the rater regarding growth of the student teacher. This is seen as a means of making the evaluation more personal.

Regarding the use of the rating scale, its recommended use is at the middle and conclusion of the student teaching period by all involved in the program. The scale should be used independently by the college supervisor, cooperating teacher, and student teacher and should be followed by a conference so that the student teacher's ability and progress can be evaluated effectively. Use at the recommended two times would necessitate a second column for rating. Use at the suggested times is not meant to preclude evaluation throughout the student teaching period.

A page of pertinent information on the development of the rating scale has been written. (See Appendix.) Accompanying the scale, this will give users some concept of the basis for its construction and of its quality.

Suggestions for further study arising from this research are:

1. to determine ways to promote growth in the student teacher in the areas emerging in the scale and especially in the five areas resulting from the multiple regression analysis.

2. to train raters (possibly by analysis of a film of student teacher performance) in the use of the scale in an attempt to bring about better agreement.

3. to develop other means of evaluating student teaching performance, e.g., use the same procedure to develop a rating scale to be used by pupils to evaluate the student teachers and compare results with those from this scale.

4. to use the scale in the evaluation of teaching performance of first year teachers.

5. to develop another scale for the evaluation of first year home economics teachers following this methodology.

Bibliography

1. Almy, H.C. and Sorenson, Herbert. "A Teacher-Rating Scale of Determined Reliability and Validity," *Educational Administration and Supervision*, 16, No. 3 (March 1930), 179-86.

2. Anderson, C.C. and Hunka, S.M. "Teacher Evaluation: Some Problems and a Proposal," *Harvard Educational Review*, 33, No. 1 (Winter 1963), 74-95.

3. Anderson, Harold Milton. "A Study of Certain Criteria of Teacher Effectiveness, *Journal of Experimental Education*, 23, No. 1 (September 1954), 41-72.

4. The Association for Student Teaching. *Evaluating Student Teaching: A Forward Look at Theories and Practices*. The 39th Yearbook. Cedar Falls, Iowa: Association for Student Teaching, 1960.

5. Bach, Jacob O. "A Scale for Evaluating Student Teaching." *The Evaluation of Student Teaching*. 1949 Yearbook of the Association for Student Teaching. Lock Haven, Pa.: Association for Student Teaching, 1949, 124-31.

6. Barr, A.S. *Characteristic Differences in the Teaching Performance of Good and Poor Teachers of the Social Studies*. Bloomington, Illinois: Public School Publishing Company, (Currently the Bobbs-Merrill Co., Inc., Indianapolis, Indiana), 1929.

7. __________. "The Measurement and Prediction of Teaching Efficiency: A Summary of Investigations," *Journal of Experimental Education*, 16, No. 4 (June 1948), 203-83.

8. __________. "Teacher Effectiveness and Its Correlates," Wisconsin Studies on the Measurement and Prediction of Teacher Effectiveness," *Journal of Experimental Education*, 30, No. 1 (September 1961), 134-52.

9. Blank, Lane Burton. "Critical Incidents in the Behavior of Secondary School Physical Education Instructors," *The Research Quarterly*, 29, No. 1 (March 1958), 1-6.

10. Brown, Clara Maude. *An Evaluation of the Minnesota Rating Scale For Home Economics Teachers*. Minneapolis, Minnesota: The University of Minnesota Press, 1931.

11. Castetter, D. Dee et al. *Teacher Effectiveness: An Annotated Bibliography*. V. 1, No. 1 Bloomington, Indiana: Institute of Educational Research, School of Education, 1954.

12. Charters, W.W. and Waples, Douglas. The Commonwealth Teacher-Training Study. Chicago, Illinois: The University of Chicago Press, 1929.

13. Combs, Arthur W. and Mitzel, Harold E. "Can We Measure Good Teaching Objectively?" NEA Journal, 53, No. 1 (January 1964), 34-46, 73.

14. Darlington, Richard B. Increasing Test Validity through the Use of Inter-item Correlations. Ph.D. Dissertation. Minneapolis, Minnesota: University of Minnesota, 1963.

15. Drobish, Susan Kelly. "Analysis of a Rating Scale for Student Teachers in Home Economics." M.S. Thesis. Lafayette, Indiana: Purdue University, 1966.

16. Flanagan, John C. "The Critical Incident Technique," Psychological Bulletin, 51, No. 4 (July 1954), 327-58.

17. Guilford, J.P. Psychometric Methods. 2nd Edition. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1954.

18. Hatcher, Hazel M. Characteristic Differences Among Homemaking Teachers of Varying Proficiency. Bulletin No. 288. Lansing: Department of Education, Michigan State University and the State Board of Control for Vocational Education, August 1944.

19. Mastin, Victor E. "Teacher Enthusiasm," Journal of Educational Research, 56, No. 7 (March 1963), 385-86.

20. Mayhew, Lewis B. "The Critical Incident Technique in Educational Evaluation," Journal of Educational Research, 40 (1956), 591-98.

21. Michaelis, John U. "Teacher Education--Student Teaching and Internship," Encyclopedia of Educational Research. Chester W. Harris (Ed.), New York: The Macmillan Company, 1960.

22. Nelson, Kenneth G. et al. Development and Refinement of Measures of Teaching Effectiveness. First Report of the Cooperative Study to Predict Effectiveness in Secondary School Teaching. Albany, New York: The University of the State of New York, The State Education Department, 1956.

23. Peck, Robert G. "Personality Patterns of Prospective Teachers," Journal of Experimental Education, 29, (December 1960), 169-78.

24. Peronto, Archie L. "The Abilities and Patterns of Behaviors of Good and Poor Teachers," Wisconsin Studies of the Measurement and Prediction of Teacher Effectiveness, Journal of Experimental Education, 30, No. 1, (September 1961), 88-98.

25. Rhodes, Fred G. and Peckham, Dorothy R. "Evaluative Reports on Student Teaching," Journal of Teacher Education, 11 (December 1960), 520-23.

26. Schultz, Raymond E. and Ohlsen, Merle M. "How to Define a Good Teacher," School Executive, 73 (July 1954), 46-47.

27. Slater, Shirley. "A Study of the Final Evaluation of Home Economics Student Teachers." M.S. Thesis. Athens, Ohio: Ohio University, 1965.

28. Sugarman, Ruth. Evaluation of Student Teaching at the Buffalo State College for Teachers. Ph.D. Dissertation. Buffalo, N.Y.: University of Buffalo, 1953.

29. Tanner, W.C. "Personality Bases in Teacher Selection," Phi Delta Kappan, 35, (April 1954), 271-74, 77.

30. Thorndike, R.L. Personnel Selection. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1949.

31. Torgerson, T.L. "The Measurement and Prediction of Teaching Ability," Review of Educational Research, 4, No. 3 (June 1934), 261-66.

32. Tyler, Fred T. and Michaelis, John U. "Diagnostic and Predictive Values of the Johnson Temperament Analysis Used in Student Teaching," Journal of Teacher Education, 2 (March 1951), 18-20.

33. Velez, Naomi Rodriquez. "A Rating Scale for Evaluating Student Teachers in Homemaking Education." Master's Problem. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University, 1950.

34. Wilson, Donald E. "A Survey of Evaluation Instruments and Procedures Used in California Teacher Training Institutions During the Directed Teaching Experiences," Journal of Educational Research, 48, No. 9 (May 1955).

35. Worcester, D.A. "Some Assumptions, Explicitly and Implicitly Made in the Investigations Here Summarized," Wisconsin Studies of the Measurement and Prediction of Teacher Effectiveness, Journal of Experimental Education, 30, No. 1 (September 1961), 120-33.

GLOSSARY

Student Teacher - a college or university student who teaches and carries out associated duties in a teaching center affiliated with the college; occasionally abbreviated as ST

Cooperating teacher or supervising teacher - a school staff member who assists the college or university by directing the student teacher in her student teaching experience; abbreviated as CT

College supervisor - the university staff member who visits the student teacher in the student teaching center and who with the cooperating teacher guides and evaluates the student teacher's performance; abbreviated as CS

Student teaching center - a school which provides its facilities for the student teaching experience

Critical incident - a critical incident involves the description of a student teacher's behavior that has resulted in her being either outstandingly effective or ineffective during the period of practice in which she gradually assumes the role of teacher

Grader group - composed of all individuals who were responsible for grading student teachers

First stage rating scale - Original rating scale of 112 items; abbreviated as RS-112

Second stage rating scale - Revised instrument containing 35 items plus four; abbreviated as RS-35

APPENDIX

INSTITUTIONS PARTICIPATING IN SOME OR ALL OF THREE DATA COLLECTIONS

Connecticut
Saint Joseph College
University of Connecticut

Indiana
Ball State University
Butler University
Goshen College
Indiana University
St. Mary-of-the-Woods College
Valparaiso University

Kentucky
Berea College
Kentucky State College
Morehead State University
Western Kentucky University

Maine
University of Maine

Massachusetts
State College at Framingham
University of Massachusetts

New Hampshire
Keene Teachers College

New Jersey
Douglass College (Rutgers Univ.)
Montclair State College

New York
Cornell University
Hunter College
State University College,
Plattsburgh
Syracuse University

Ohio
Ashland College
Bluffton College
Kent State University
Notre Dame College
Our Lady of Cincinnati College
University of Dayton
Ursuline College for Women

Pennsylvania
Albright College
Carnegie Institute of Technology
Cheyney State College
Indiana University
Juniata College
Mansfield State College
Marywood College
Mercyhurst College
Pennsylvania State University
Seton Hill College

Rhode Island
University of Rhode Island

Tennessee
David Lipscomb College
Memphis State University
Middle Tennessee State University
Tennessee A&I State University
University of Tennessee,
Martin Branch

Vermont
University of Vermont

West Virginia
Marshall University
West Virginia University

Each data collection involved a different group of student teachers; hence they may be considered independent samples.

LETTER TO PROSPECTIVE PARTICIPANTS

Home Economics Education
Martha Van Rensselaer Hall
Cornell University
Ithaca, New York 14850

Dear

I am asking cooperating teachers, college supervisors, and student teachers to assist in research that is being conducted as a part of a larger project for the Ph.D. degree. Approval for your cooperation has been secured from the head of the home economics division at the college or university with which you are connected. The study will ultimately be concerned with the construction of an instrument to evaluate student teaching in home economics. For the initial phase of this research, a study of the requirements of student teachers' behavior will be collected. The description of the technique that will be used in this study is:

> A critical incident involves the description of a student teacher's behavior that has resulted in her being either outstandingly effective or ineffective in a period of practice in which she has the opportunity of integrating the various learnings of her professional preparation and thereby increasing her perspective of the total role of a home economics teacher. Some of the areas in which this behavior might occur are:
>
> 1. performance in the classroom
> 2. preparation for teaching
> 3. relationships with faculty
> 4. relationships with parents
> 5. relationships with cooperating teachers
> 6. extra curricular activities
> 7. duties associated with teaching

Your assistance is vitally needed in determining these incidents. You are asked to supply the names of the persons involved in the situation so that the critical incidents that are described by the cooperating teacher, college supervisor, and student teacher may be matched. All data will be coded and handled confidentially; no names will be used in the report of the study. This study is to continue during the month of May.

Please describe the situation in terms of what was actually observed or done rather than inferred from what you saw or did. Do not state, for example, that "the lesson plans of the student teacher, Miss Jones, the student teacher, did not organize the content logically, learning experiences were not varied, objectives were not stated in behavioral terms, etc." Another situation reported in terms of inferred behavior is: "I (the student teacher reporting) seem to favor Susan." This could better be described by stating: "I call upon Susan almost every time she raises her hand even when others volunteer."

Try to give as detailed a description as possible of the behavior rather than listing generalized traits or abstractions. Attempt to be objective and unbiased in your reporting.

Incidents of outstandingly effective and ineffective student teacher behavior should be reported as they occur. You will probably not find them occurring at any regular interval. Remember, the incident must involve some specific aspect of the student teacher's behavior that makes her outstandingly effective or ineffective in student teaching. Please report the situations without conferring with the other individuals involved.

The attached sheets contain a sample of a type of incident that you may be contributing this month. The format will remain the same as you supply information about the situations you observe. Please become familiar with the information sheet and fill it in as soon as an incident involving effective and ineffective student teaching behavior occurs. Do not wait. Each time an incident occurs, record the incident at once, and do not go back and change any of your statements later. When you have four or five incidents recorded, send them in the stamped, self addressed envelope provided to:

Miss Joan Gritzmacher
Home Economics Education
Martha Van Rensselaer
Cornell University
Ithaca, New York

If you should need additional forms for recording the data, you may use a sheet of paper and number the items or request additional forms from me at the above address.

I will be most appreciative of your cooperation in this study.

Sincerely yours,

Enc.

MATERIALS FOR COLLECTING CRITICAL INCIDENTS

SAMPLE CRITICAL INCIDENT OF STUDENT TEACHER'S BEHAVIOR

Description-definition of critical incident: A critical incident involves the description of the student teacher's behavior that has resulted in her being either outstandingly effective or ineffective during the period of practice in which she gradually assumes the role of teacher. Some of the areas in which this behavior might occur are:

1. performance in the classroom
2. preparation for teaching
3. relationships with faculty
4. relationships with parents
5. relationships with cooperating teacher
6. extra curricular activities
7. duties associated with teaching

1. Name the people involved in the situation. Place an X before your name.

College Supervisor Mrs. Ready
Cooperating Teacher Mrs. Childs
X Student Teacher Miss Rider
Other (Specify)

2. Date the situation occurred 2/24/65

3. School in which the situation took place Horace Mann High School

4. Description of the situation I gave the 7th grade class a post test on their unit on Personal Relationships and found after analyzing the test that the pupils had not learned the content in a few areas. As a result I changed my lesson plans for the next day (with the approval of Mrs. Childs) and retaught the content that the pupils apparently had not understood.

5. What caused the situation? Inability to recognize that I was not getting through to the pupils.

6. Why do you think that this behavior indicates effectiveness or ineffectiveness? When I realized that the pupils had done poorly in certain areas of the test, I decided that since this learning was important and since I had evidently not done a good job, I had better reteach the content that they had not understood in another way. I wanted the pupils to attain the objectives that had been formulated for this unit.

7. What action did the people named in item 1 take as a result of the incident? When I gave the pupils a test on their beginning foods work at the end of the next week, I added a small section on the Personal Relationships content that they had done so poorly on before. This time they did much better.

SAMPLE CRITICAL INCIDENT OF STUDENT TEACHER'S BEHAVIOR

Description-definition of critical incident: A critical incident involves the description of a student teacher's behavior that has resulted in her being either outstandingly effective or ineffective during the period of practice in which she gradually assumes the role of teacher. Some of the areas in which this behavior might occur are:

1. performance in the classroom
2. preparation for teaching
3. relationships with faculty
4. relationships with parents
5. relationships with cooperating teachers
6. extra curricular activities
7. duties associated with teaching

1. Name the people involved in the situation. Place an X before your name.

College Supervisor Miss Green
X Cooperating Teacher Miss Smith
Student Teacher Miss Brown
Other (Specify)

2. Date the situation occurred 2/15/65

3. School in which the situation took place Gresley High School

4. Description of the situation Miss Brown was ignoring some of the work habits of the pupils in her 7th grade foods class. They were not choosing the proper measuring tools and were not sifting and leveling the flour correctly. Dishes and utensils in some cases were washed in dirty dishwater and equipment was occasionally put away in the wrong places.

5. What caused the situation? Miss Brown had not reviewed with the pupils procedures and standards before the lab. She had not considered work habits when writing objectives, and evaluative plans included only analysis of the final product and a paper-and-pencil test mainly on principles.

6. Why do you think that this behavior indicates effectiveness or ineffectiveness? Full use of learning experiences is not taking place. Work standards are important aspects involved in food preparation.

7. What action did the people named in item 1 take as a result of the incident? Miss Brown and I discussed the laboratory as well as other classes in a conference after school. As a result Miss Brown planned to have the pupils evaluate their learnings with emphasis on work habits during the next class session.

INFORMATION SHEET FOR REPORTING CRITICAL INCIDENTS OF STUDENT TEACHER'S BEHAVIOR

Description-definition of critical incident: A critical incident involves the description of a student teacher's behavior that has resulted in her being either outstandingly effective or ineffective during the period of practice in which she gradually assumes the role of teacher. These incidents may be rather small as illustrated by the example involving evaluation of student learnings in the unit on Personal Relationships or relatively broad as illustrated by the example involving work habits of pupils in foods lab. Some of the areas in which this behavior might occur are:

1. performance in the classroom
2. preparation for teaching
3. relationships with faculty
4. relationships with parents
5. relationships with cooperating teacher
6. extra curricular activities
7. duties associated with teaching

1. Name the people involved in the situation. Place an X before your name.

College Supervisor____________________
Cooperating Teacher____________________
Student Teacher____________________
Other (Specify)____________________

2. Date the situation occurred______________________________

3. School in which the situation occurred________________________

4. Description of the situation______________________________

5. What caused the situation?______________________________

6. Why do you think that this behavior indicates effectiveness or ineffectiveness?______________________________

7. What action did the people named in item 1 take as a result of the incident?______________________________

SAMPLE ANALYSES OF CRITICAL INCIDENTS OF STUDENT TEACHER BEHAVIOR

Incident #270

Reporter: ST

4. A laboratory class-demonstration of an oven baked meal - the preparing of Swiss Steak. I was extremely nervous and uncertain - time ran out and the Swiss Steak was not even in the oven. The vegetables were never prepared as a demonstration. The planned student-teacher time table for procedure the following day did not even get started.

5. I have never prepared Swiss Steak before and had not rehearsed the demonstration, therefore I was very unsure of what steps to take, how to do it, and whether or not it was coming out right.

6. The students I know sensed this uneasiness on my part and so were inattentive. Demonstrations should be examples of "how to" as well as why and with a poor model it is impossible to know what to do on your own.

7. Luckily I was able to repeat the same lab demonstration that afternoon on another class. This time it moved much more smoothly - also as a result of a brief noon conference with the teacher. The next day I simply outlined the procedure for the day - no student-teacher cooperated time plan was made.

Incident #326

Reporter: CT

4. ST was aghast at her first 7th grade foods lab. It didn't take her long to see that she had overestimated their ability and underestimated the time in which they could do their work.

5. So much to do and only 50 min. in which to do it.

6. This problem is one that all foods teachers have. Everyone has to learn how to handle the individual situation. ST realized what was wrong and took care.

7. ST quickly made a lab sheet that was an excellent guide and a big help for the students.

SAMPLE ANALYSES OF CRITICAL INCIDENTS OF STUDENT TEACHER BEHAVIOR, CONTINUED

Incident No.	Phrases Indicating Critical Behaviors	Effectice or Ineffective Behavior Use E or I	Number of Category(ies) Under Which This Behavior Fits Circle Main One	Suggested Category
270	extremely nervous and uncertain	I	1b	
	time ran out and the Swiss Steak was not even in the oven; vegetables were never prepared as a demonstration	I	5a	
	had never prepared Swiss Steak before–unsure of what steps to take, how to do it, and whether or not it was coming out right	I	3c 3d	
	had not rehearsed the demonstration	I	5c	
326	overestimated their ability and underestimated the time in which they could do their work	I	3b	

CATEGORIES OF STUDENT TEACHER BEHAVIOR DERIVED FROM CRITICAL INCIDENTS

1. Personal Qualities
    a. voice
    b. poise
    c. assumption of responsibility
2. Lesson Planning
    a. utilization of knowledge of students' abilities, background
    b. lesson goals
    c. structuring of subject-matter (concepts, generalizations)
    d. preparation of questions to develop students' ability to think
    e. learning experiences
    f. teaching aids and materials
    g. evaluation of pupils
3. Functioning in a Classroom Situation
    a. use of motivation/interest approach
    b. adaptation to students' level
    c. accuracy and conceptual development of subject matter
    d. use of techniques and methods
    e. use of teaching aids and materials
    f. use of review
    g. use of summary (drawing together of generalizations)
    h. application of learnings to situations outside the school
    i. asking questions and handling pupils' questions
    j. evaluation of students' progress
4. Ability to Obtain Student Involvement
5. Organization of Time
    a. classroom
    b. student teacher work en toto
    c. pre class preparation of aids, materials, etc.
6. Alertness to Classroom Activity
    a. teacher direction and supervision
    b. classroom control
    c. behavior in emergency or unexpected situation
7. Care of the Department
8. Inter-personal Relationships
    a. rapport with cooperating teacher, faculty
    b. rapport with students
    c. rapport with parents
9. Extra Curricular Activities
10. Professional Qualities
    a. professional attitude and judgment
    b. professional growth

FIRST STAGE RATING SCALE

Student Teacher____________________

Cooperating Teacher________________

College Supervisor_________________

College or University______________

Date______________________________

RATING SCALE FOR THE EVALUATION OF STUDENT TEACHERS IN HOME ECONOMICS

DIRECTIONS: Read the descriptions and write the number (a whole number, no fractions) corresponding to the observed behavior of the student teacher in the box following the descriptions. Use zero when there has been no opportunity to observe a specific behavior.

NOTE: The abbreviation CT stands for Cooperating Teacher.

Inter-rater reliab.[1]	No observation 0	1	2 3	4 5	Rating	Correlation with student teaching grade r/STG[2]	D
.57	1 PERSONAL QUALITIES GENERAL	(1) shows insecurity; displays anxiety and fear	usually appears outwardly confident but occasionally shows symptoms of insecurity	exhibits confidence in what she is doing		.47	.24
.38		(2) does not objectively evaluate self	has some awareness of strengths and limitations	realizes her strengths and limitations		.51	.07
.56	23*	(3) lacks enthusiasm	shows moderate enthusiasm	radiates enthusiasm		.56	.26
.53		(4) apathetic about subject matter	usually exhibits interest in what she is teaching	displays much interest in subject matter		.59	.20
.40		(5) "gives up" in crises; ceases to function under pressure	works satisfactorily under some pressure; begins to show signs of upset with increased pressure	works effectively under pressure		.53	.25
.42	24*	(6) lacks patience with students; shows annoyance	usually remains patient in dealings with students	displays patience with students		.47	.09
.29	10** 33*	(7) frequently mispronounces words; repeats trite expressions	generally pronounces words correctly; vocabulary is adequate	has correct pronunciation; uses varied vocabulary		.33	.17
.40		(8) is not willing to help others or does so grudgingly	assists others most of the time; especially those who request assistance	is cooperative; helps others		.46	.09

NOTE: Explanation of asterisks on following page.
Explanation of footnotes on following page.

Explanations of Asterisks

1 N= 194

2 N= 125 matching cases of CS-CT

* Second stage rating scale resulting from Darlington analysis. Number indicates order of importance in increasing Validity Coefficient

** Significant items from Regression Analysis predicting student teaching grades. Number indicates step in Analysis

reliab.	No observation 0	1	2 3	4 5	Rating	r/STG	D
.46	22*	(9) becomes upset with suggestions	usually seeks and utilizes suggestions	invites suggestions and implements them		.49	.26
.47	1a PERSONAL QUALITIES VOICE	(10) does not speak clearly; tends to mumble; voice is too soft or too loud	usually speaks clearly so that students can hear	speaks clearly and sufficiently loud		.39	.21
.34		(11) speaks in a monotone	usually changes the tone of speech	effectively modulates her voice		.38	.23
.40		(12) lacks firmness when speaking	secures students' attention in quiet groups; may lack authority for large and/or vivacious groups	voice is authoritative; students in any size group give attention promptly		.45	.20
.27	21*	(13) pitches voice at irritating level	keeps voice at pleasant level most of the time	pitches voice at pleasing level		.34	.10
.46	1b PERSONAL QUALITIES POISE	(14) exhibits uneasiness; sometimes acts like a student instead of a teacher	occasionally shows nervousness under normal conditions; displays maturity expected of her age group	shows ability to control self; remains calm and at ease in all situations, displays unusual maturity		.55	.22
.52	1c ASSUMPTION OF RESPONSIBILITY	(15) shirks responsibility	accepts only assigned responsibilities	accepts responsibility; often seeks responsibility beyond that which is required		.53	.18

reliab.	No observation 0	1	2	3	4	5	Rating	r/STG	D
.46		(16) promises to do things but doesn't carry through; often ignores or neglects obvious tasks		usually does what she agrees to do but occasionally forgets some things		is dependable		.54	.18
.63	2 LESSON 29* PLANNING GENERAL	(17) lacks detailed planning; does not organize lesson; lesson plans are incomplete		does some detailed planning; tends to use general outline rather than detailed plans; organization is usually adequate; lesson plans are usually complete		does detailed planning; organizes content effectively; lesson plans are rarely incomplete		.57	.29
.53		(18) does not present lesson plan in time for discussion and evaluation before class presentation		usually has lessons done in advance; usually examines these with CT		has lesson plans completed to allow sufficient discussion with CT		.59	.32
.46	4** 12**	(19) overlooks pre-planning for time organization and/or makes unrealistic estimate of time needed for each activity		establishes a time plan for lesson but it is not always satisfactory		adequately pre-plans general timing of lesson parts		.61	.25
.57		(20) unwilling or unable to adapt plans to suggestions of CT		tries to implement lesson plan suggestions of CT but neglects or ignores some of these		adapts lesson plar to CT's suggestions		.67	.20

reliab.	No observation 0	1 2	3	4 5	Rating	r/STG	D
.41	2a LESSON PLANNING UTILIZATION OF KNOWLEDGE OF STUDENTS' ABILITIES	(21) does not concern herself with where student is	occasionally employs methods to ascertain characteristics of her students	uses various means to find information about students' knowledge, abilities, background		.52	.22
.51		(22) does not understand students; considers structure of content not students when planning lesson	exhibits comprehension of students but lacks understanding occasionally	understands students and uses this knowledge to plan meaningful lessons and individual work		.54	.44
.47	2b LESSON PLANNING OBJECTIVES 13** 15**	(23) is not concerned with objectives or is concerned with her objectives and with imposing them on students	objectives are comprehensive but are not always important nor stated in student behavioral terms	objectives are important and comprehensive and expressed in student behavioral terms		.53	.23
.39	2e LESSON 28* PLANNING PREPARATION OF QUESTIONS	(24) does not plan lead-in questions to lesson	plans questions to involve students in learning	plans well thought through questions to motivate student discussion		.53	.28

reliab.	No observation 0		1 2	3	4 5	Rating	r/STG	D
.24	27*	(26)	plans to have students involved in only one activity during class or cannot move students along so that activity can be changed	usually plans activities of varying nature to change pace during class period	recognizes and plans for a change of pace during a class period		.54	.27
.40	8*	(27)	considers general learning experiences not details; plans activities that have little relationship to each other	plans learning experiences that usually increase from the simple to the complex and broad	thoroughly plans each learning experience and each builds on the former		.62	.29
.46	2g LESSON PLANNING TEACHING AIDS AND MATERIALS	(28)	does not provide many teaching aids or plans make - shift or inappropriate aid; does not make use of available resources	usually plans and provides some appropriate teaching aids if they can be readily secured	plans and/or takes initiative to provide numerous appropriate teaching aids		.57	.23
.23	2h LESSON PLANNING EVALUATION	(29)	has limited concept of evaluation; procrastinates and does not carry through or evaluates only at end of unit or sees evaluation only in terms of giving final marks at the end of each period	has limited concept of evaluation but studies to broaden it; evaluates student growth occasionally	frequently plans varied assessment of student growth		.47	.24

reliab.	No observation 0	1	2	3	4	5	Rating	r/STG	D
.27	16*	(30) constructs haphazard evaluation devices; on paper and pencil tests uses "recall" type items exclusively		plans evaluative techniques carefully but some inadequacies emerge		evaluation procedures are carefully thought through and measure student growth adequately		.49	.25
.49	3** 5* 3a USE OF MOTIVATION/ APPROACH	(31) does not provide any motivation at beginning of period or attempts at motivation fail; does not gain attention and cooperation of students		commonly utilizes an interest approach which tends to be ordinary; occasionally exhibits creative effort in motivation; has some success motivating students		provides initial stimulus that is creative and pertinent to the topic; captures student attention and interest		.65	.32
.42	10*	(32) threatens students in an attempt to motivate them; does not expect student self motivation		provides initial and occasional stimuli thereafter to motivate students; occasionally allows students to put their ideas into action		provides continual stimuli during class to motivate students and encourage them to carry through their own ideas		.59	.23
.35	34*	(33) is insensitive to students' needs		is aware of students' most obvious needs		is alert to students' needs; gives incentive to individual pupils having difficulty with the work		.55	.27
.45		(34) continues activity without changing environmental conditions; disregards lack of student interest		alters environmental conditions when situation becomes such that the majority of the students are not paying attention or a few are very disruptive		alters environmental conditions when necessary or conducive to the increase of student interest		.60	.32

reliab.	No observation 0		1	2	3	4	5	Rating	r/STG	D
.42	3b ADAPTATION TO STUDENTS' LEVEL	(35)	fails to consider students' previous knowledge, ability and needs		attempts to understand students but does not make full use of available information on background, ability, and needs in teaching and evaluating; unaware of clues to readjust lesson		uses information on students' background, ability, and needs in teaching and evaluative procedures; is alert to clues to readjust lesson		.56	.25
.20		(36)	balance of theoretical and practical content bears no relationship to students' abilities		over emphasizes either the theoretical or practical content at times		combines the theoretical and the practical in accordance with students' abilities		.55	.25
.51	4* 3c STRUCTURING OF SUBJECT MATTER	(37)	presents skimpy content; does not develop generalizations or attempts to develop too many; does not emphasize important points; superficial development of subject		usually presents adequate content for period; does not always develop generalizations to their fullest		lesson is comprehensive; focuses on a few generalizations which are developed in depth		.64	.29
.48	9*	(38)	exhibits concern over subject matter but not whether students understand it; does not clarify points		attempts largely by repetition to explain content that students do not comprehend		when content is not understood, goes over it again in a different way; clarifies statements		.62	.27

reliab.	No observation 0	1	2	3	4	5	Rating	r/STG	D
.36		(39) gives little thought to sequential development of content; presents lesson in rambling, unorganized manner		attempts to structure content in orderly fashion but some is misplaced		organizes content so that it is developed logically		.59	.26
.33	-	(40) frequently digresses from plan		sometimes fails to follow lesson plan		follows general lesson plan		.45	.15
.32	6*	(41) does not interrelate parts of lesson or lessons		attempts to point out relatedness or content but this is sometimes unclear		shows relationship between parts of lesson and lessons		.63	.28
.42		(42) gives faulty or false information; does not distinguish between fact and opinion		does not clearly define fact versus opinion		differentiates fact from opinion in presenting subject matter		.59	.24
.40		(43) is not well acquainted nor experienced with most home economics subject matter		has good grasp of subject matter in some areas; slight lack of knowledge in other areas		has extensive up-to-date knowledge in most areas of home economics		.52	.23
.40	1** 1*	(44) unconcerned about familiarizing herself with subject about which she knows little		makes an attempt to search out information to teach unfamiliar subjects		conscienciously prepares self to teach unfamiliar material by reading, visits, observations		.67	.27

reliab.	No observation 0	1 2	3 4	5	Rating	r/STG	D
.29	13*	(45) bluffs way through answers to questions she does not know; ignores questions; changes subject	admits lack of knowledge but neglects to find answer	admits lack of knowledge when questioned on a specific point she does not know; uses resources to answer		.61	.22
.33		(46) does not anticipate student questions; is faced with many individual questions	sometimes foresees questions that stuients will ask and handles them in the presence of the collective students	anticipates student questions and answers them in the presence of the class as a whole		.55	.34
.29	7* 3d TECHNIQUES AND METHODS	(47) plans and/or changes method little or not at all during period; or plans too many activities to fit into period; or cannot move students along so that activity can be changed; individual activities incongruent w/respect to total	plans and utilizes a few meaningful learning experiences during a period; choice of experience not always the best; provides different kinds of activities for change of pace	plans and provides varied, meaningful activities to develop principles presented; provides change of pace during period		.63	.27
.52		(48) does not make use of resource persons, community resources; ignores opportunities to broaden learning	contacts outside resources but does not always follow them up for use in class	enriches learning experiences by occasionally securing a resource person or using a community resource; takes advantage of some unexpected circumstances to enlarge concepts		.50	.26

reliab.	No observation 0	1	2	3	4	5	Rating	r/STG	D
.36		(49) neglects to bring out essential learnings; when demonstrating has long periods of silence or emphasizes one thing excessively; insufficent explanation		attempts to use learning experiences to full extent but does not utilize all the possibilities		thoroughly plans and makes use of learning experiences; sets standards for work		.60	.29
.44		(50) lacks concern for logical organization of activity; plans activities that have little relationship to each other		tries to structure activities in ascending order of development but occasionally a learning experience is misplaced		logically develops activities and each builds on the former		.60	.27
.48		(51) does not check to determine if demonstration or teaching materials are visible to all; no eye contact with group; almost ignores them		is usually alert to situation and checks on visibility of demonstration and materials to students; tries to ascertain reaction of students to teacher activity		makes sure that all can see materials or demonstration; checks to see student response to teacher activity frequently		.54	.25
.25	3e TEACHING AIDS AND MATERIALS	(52) does not make situation realistic by sufficient examples; makes no attempt to search for examples		provides scanty or irrelevant examples		uses appropriate examples to clarify and add interest		.54	.19

reliab.	No observation 0	1	2	3	4	5	Rating	r/STG	D
.26	30*	(53) materials are neither handy nor arranged in good order		has the minimum number of materials on hand or prepares them as they are needed during class		has necessary and appropriate materials readily available		.57	.24
.39		(54) rarely uses bulletin board; it has superficial purpose or material remains posted past time of use or interest		occasionally prepares bulletin boards, but often they do not have significant relationship to the lesson content or appropriate student learnings		prepares bulletin boards as she sees the need; displays are educationally sound as well as attractive		.49	.25
.39		(55) presentation lacks illustrative material or needs more; does not make full use of materials; material is not closely related to objectives of lesson		usually reinforces teaching by use of a number of appropriate teaching aids		uses many imaginative, attractive, and appropriate teaching aids that gain student interest and participation and advance learning		.56	.26
.29		(56) teaching aids are not always realistic		uses teaching aids but lacks concern for having them as realistic as possible		makes teaching aid situation as real as possible if reality cannot be attained		.55	.21
.22	3f	(57) reviews at a few pre-established times or does not review		is inclined to overlook unexpected possibilities for review		spontaneously reviews material when situation warrants or need becomes apparent		.50	.23

reliab.	No observation 0		1 2	3 4	5	Rating	r/STG	D
.28		(58)	does not provide any or enough review to reinforce learning or hurries over material so that effort is a waste of time or covers material exactly as it will be handled in test situation; uses dull methodology	usually plans for review but occasionally neglects to carry it out; important content is covered	plans and carries out comprehensive review; interesting, creative manner		.50	.27
.24	3g SUMMARY	(59)	does not summarize	sometimes brings together learnings	ties material together		.55	.24
.16		(60)	presents students with the facts or generalizations to be derived or omits this	secures some student involvement in formulating generalizations but largely tells them about generalizations	helps and/or requires students to make pertinent generalizations		.48	.27
.34	17* 3h APPLICATION	(61)	does not attempt to provide enough prior information or experience; students are not likely to transfer ideas and practices to the home	occasionally provides experiences in the classroom that can be carried over	provides realistic learning experiences so that students can actively transfer learnings		.49	.22

reliab.	No observation 0	1	2	3	4	5	Rating	r/STG	D
.42	18* 31 QUESTIONS	(62) asks vague questions; minor not "meaty" ones; does not utilize lead-in questions or confines questions to items of fact students may remember		utilizes some stimulating and some dull questions; some require more teacher development		has lead, thought-provoking, suitable to-the-lesson questions ready to ask		.55	.31
.29		(63) dodges student questions; answers own questions rather than getting answers from students; allows class to drift away from topic		accepts student contributions but does not thoroughly relate them to classwork; occasionally will enlarge upon student statements		supplements student contributions and questions by adding comments and asking questions which will clarify and relate to the topic of the day if possible		.55	.20
.36		(64) involves few class members in questioning process; does not encourage discussion		permits further discussion as a result of questioning process but does not do anything to encourage it		motivates further discussion among students by questions		.53	.25
.27		(65) does not treat student questions with respect		usually promotes atmosphere in which students are free to ask questions		makes students feel at ease to ask questions		.51	.17

reliab.	No observation 0	1	2	3	4	5	Rating	r/STG	D
.33		(66) does not attempt to secure answers to questions or promises but doesn't carry through; students are not informed		attempts to obtain unknown answer by involving students or self effort but occasionally forgets to inform students		makes use of available resources or directs students to find answers that are not immediately known; information is reported back to class		.50	.21
.39	3j EVALUATION	(67) does not evaluate learnings; assumes that students are learning		shows some interest in whether or not students are progressing toward objectives		exhibits concern over whether students are learning what she is teaching		.53	.22
.32		(68) does not give pre-tests		occasionally administers pre-tests but does not make full use of the results		utilizes pre-test information to learn where to start with students		.37	.27
.26		(69) rarely evaluates or does not evaluate learnings; utilizes evaluation procedures that are too difficult or ambiguous; uses little variety in evaluation; seldom keeps records		usually evaluates student progress at appropriate times; relies on only a few evaluative techniques or occasionally uses varied techniques or has a concentration of different techniques at one time makes effort to keep records		continually evaluates student progress using varied and appropriate methods; keeps records		.49	.25

reliab.	No observation 0	1	2	3	4	5	Rating	r/STG	D
.18		(70) has not provided adequate testing situation		tries to have appropriate situation for testing		prepares the environment for evaluation procedures		.43	.20
.27	5**	(71) gives same test for make-up purposes; make-up test is either too hard or too easy in relation to original; omits make-up tests		prepares a make-up test not adequately different from the original		constructs a different but similar test for students who have been absent		.29	.36
.19	4 STUDENT INVOLVEMENT	(72) fails to plan with students or plan far enough with students; does not involve students		occasionally includes students in planning		uses teacher-pupil planning when appropriate - most advantageous to student learning		.50	.31
.34		(73) content and learning experiences fail to obtain student response		content and learning experiences interest students and stimulate some participation		content and learning experiences actively involve and motivate students		.56	.26
.28		(74) does not call on students by name		does not always call students by name		addresses all students by name		.35	.12
.46	5a 11* CLASSROOM TIME	(75) lesson too fast moving and material covered too rapidly or lesson too slow moving and interest waning		paces lesson at adequate rate of speed		has excellent sense of pace or tempo in the lesson		.62	.30

reliab.	No observation 0	1	2	3	4	5	Rating	r/STG	D
.29		(76) inflexibly follows time plan no matter how unsuitable it might have become; fails to urge students to move along; gets "carried away" with topic or activity; digresses		manages to keep to time plan		sticks to time plan as much as possible; uses it as a general guide for the class		.59	.35
.45	9**	(77) seems prepared with nothing else when planned activity does not fill class time		sometimes has another activity ready when time plans are exhausted before expected		can extend plans to utilize class time effectively if the time plan is executed before class ends		.57	.28
.39	5b STUDENT TEACHER WORK EN TOTO	(78) fails to organize work which results in its piling up		endeavors to arrange work so that it is completed on time; occasionally a lapse occurs		organizes work efficiently so that it is accomplished systematically		.52	.22
.41	8** 26*	(79) requests less or is unable to assume full teaching load		adequately assumes the classes allocated to her		fully assumes the teaching load assigned to her; may go beyond expected assignment		.58	.26
.32	5c PRE-CLASS PREPARATION	(80) does not gather, prepare or assemble materials and equipment before class		usually has materials and equipment assembled before class; occasionally has to find something on the spur of the moment		has materials and equipment available and arranged prior to class		.51	.16

reliab.	No observation 0		1 2	3 4	5 Rating	r/STG	D
.48		(81)	has not familiarized herself with equipment or material before class	usually studies the material and equipment so that she can use it without incident in class	has studied the materials and equipment before class and knows how to use them	.57	.25
.37	6a SUPERVISION	(82)	gives vague and insufficient directions to the class or gives no directions but implies expected behavior	sometimes gives clear directions to class; are usually understandable	gives clear directions to class; endeavors to determine if students understand	.62	.28
.36		(83)	gives little or no supervision; becomes so involved in helping some that forgets others	guides students in their work but is not able to help all who need it	carefully guides students in their work; moves from student to student as quickly as possible; is able to help all who need it	.54	.19
.27		(84)	tries to give students individual attention but is overwhelmed by those needing help; does not give group explanations	occasionally gives group explanations to minimize individual assistance desired; lacks insight into situations where group explanations would be useful; has weak routine	gives group explanations to cut down on individual help needed; has an established routine for assisting students	.52	.20

reliab.	No observation 0	1	2 3	4 5	Rating	r/STG	D
.38	6b CLASSROOM CONTROL	(85) does not recognize or do anything about inattention or undesirable behavior or weakly attempts to rectify the situation or does nothing about situation; is unsure of how much authority she can exercise	recognizes undesirable behavior of students; attempts to control but the class is slightly disrupted	recognizes and firmly handles unacceptable student behavior		.52	.25
.33		(86) has not set or made students aware of behavioral expectations	usually familiarizes students with behavioral expectations	establishes and clearly communicates standards for classroom behavior of students		.56	.26
.37		(87) metes out inappropriate discipline	disciplines flagrant behavior and ignores average misbehavior	utilizes sufficient and consistent discipline in an attempt to prevent reoccurence of misbehavior		.48	.23
.37	31*	(88) permits students without work to do whatever they like which usually disrupts class	does not always have assignments planned for students without any work	has assignments ready for those temporarily out of work or not prepared to do the assignment		.43	.18

reliab.	No observation 0	1	2	3	4	5	Rating	r/STG	D
.46		(89) attempts to direct a multitude of activities at one time; ability to control students is greatly decreased		usually manages classroom situation; rarely has excessive noise and inattention problems with students		has classroom situation under control; students are relatively quiet, attentive and/or working		.56	.27
.43	6c BEHAVIOR IN UNEXPECTED SITUATIONS	(90) becomes nervous and flustered when the unexpected happens; does little or nothing		is somewhat disturbed in unexpected situation; hesitantly acts; offers some assistance		maintains composure; takes full responsibility; acts quickly		.52	.20
.38		(91) does not continue or adapt lesson; remainder of class is confused and unorganized		attempts to adapt lesson to changed situation; transition is clumsy		exhibits flexibility in adapting lesson plans when situation warrants		.58	.22
.45		(92) corrects flagrant errors by own activity or does not recognize them		discusses errors that are very evident to the class; attempts to gain student participation in correcting the conception		corrects errors or incomplete statements; involves students in this process		.58	.26
.30		(93) never utilizes or is hesitant to make use of unexpected situation to enlarge learnings		occasionally furthers learning through use of unexpected situations		takes advantage of unexpected situations to re-emphasize and add new learnings		.54	.26
.35		(94) does not know what to do; does nothing		acts quickly to prevent dangerous situation; is not sure of choice of action		acts quickly to avert serious dangers; knows what to do		.57	.28

reliab.	No observation 0		1	2	3	4	5	Rating	r/STG	D
.27	7 35* CARE OF THE DEPARTMENT	(95)	has not established nor accepted a routine for care of the department; does not allow sufficient time for clean-up at the end of the period; neglects to check room and equipment at the end of the period		accepts unquestioningly pre-established routine for care of the department; tries to follow plans but occasionally forgets to reserve time for clean-up and supervision of process		has established a routine for care of the department; sets aside definite amount of time at end of period for clean-up; checks room and equipment at end of period		.36	.18
.50	8 11** RAPPORT WITH FACULTY	(96)	has trouble relating well to other faculty members		interacts socially with some of the faculty		is easily accepted by the faculty as one of them		.52	.29
.37		(97)	does not talk to or assist other faculty members unless necessary for her work		occasionally offers suggestions to faculty when asked; offers to assist with faculty duties		offers constructive suggestions; volunteers to help and work on cooperative tasks with other staff members		.47	.30
.66	8a RAPPORT WITH COOPERATING TEACHER	(98)	is unable to relate to CT or relationship is strained and/or unfriendly; good communication and understanding are lacking		usually relates positively to and understands CT most of the time; occasionally unwilling to relate to CT		is patient and polite in relationships with CT; tries to understand CT		.49	.17

reliab.	No observation 0	1	2	3	4	5	Rating	r/STG	D
.64	2** 2*	(99) relies excessively on CT as cannot or will not make own decisions; or ignores suggestions of CT		thinks through some problems but tends to consult CT occasionally when capable of making decisions herself		consults CT for advice after considering possible solution to difficult or unusual problem; makes and abides by decisions within her jurisdiction		.66	.30
.52	8b 7** 25* RAPPORT WITH STUDENTS	(100) students are afraid to speak out in class; appears unapproachable		tries to engender in students a feeling of her approachability and her interest in them		makes students feel at ease with her; some may even bring their problems to her		.57	.22
.35		(101) makes no comment on student contributions; severely reprimands student for wrong answers or work		occasionally shows approval of student contributions by short phrases; occasionally makes a longer comment		commends students on their contributions		.50	.21
.43		(102) lacks interest and concern for students openly; plays favorites; arouses student resentment		usually interested in and concerned with most of the students; gives help and encouragement sparingly or to a few		exhibits interest and concern for all students and gives help and encouragement		.50	.11
.42		(103) utilizes student help infrequently		requests some student help in certain tasks		asks students for help in specific areas; gives them opportunity to be needed and learn		.49	.21

reliab.	No observation 0		1	2 3	4 5	Rating	r/STG	D
.46		(104)	does not secure offers of student assistance	occasionally students ask if they can assist ST	students volunteer to help ST		.48	.20
.48	12** 14*	(105)	students seek advice of CT as they do not have faith in the correctness of student teacher's statements, directions	students usually take her word but occasionally seek verification from CT	students accept her as a knowledgeable teacher and follow her suggestions		.60	.23
.31	8c 6** RAPPORT WITH PARENTS	(106)	ignores situations where parents are in attendance; ill at ease with parents; unable to communicate concerning student problems	is hesitant about utilizing opportunities to meet parents but occasionally does; attempts explanation of home economics and student problems	takes advantage of opportunities to meet with parents; explains home economics and problems students might have		.42	.23
.45	9 20* EXTRA CURRICULAR ACTIVITIES	(107)	is concerned exclusively with classroom activity or helps others in the school to a limited extent	recognizes some of the extra curricular activities that need to be done; offers and assists with some of these; participates sometimes in community activities and programs	realizes that there are many tasks to be done in a school outside the classroom and willingly helps whether it is her specific responsibility or not; exhibits interest in and takes part in community activities and programs		.45	.27

reliab.	No observation 0		1	2	3	4	5	Rating	r/STG	D
.31	10a PROFESSIONAL ATTITUDE AND JUDGMENT	(108)	unwilling to give of her personal time to school responsibilities		seems reluctant to extend school work beyond the "school day"		realizes that teaching is not a 9-4 profession; willing to devote extra time to preparation and individual work with students		.41	.18
.44		(109)	does not display professional attitude and judgment in front of students		ideas and attitudes are occasionally unprofessional and inconsistent with actions		healthy professional attitudes and ideas are consistently displayed		.57	.26
.21		(110)	does not know school policies and regulations; acts independently of them		is knowledgeable about some school policies and regulations and attempts to guide herself by them		is familiar with school policies and regulations and abides by them		.50	.17
.31	14** 32*	(111)	sometimes degrades the home economics program		does not "talk up" the home economics program to others; occasionally speaks of the program when others bring up the topic		uses opportunities to present the home economics program to others		.47	.16
.36	10b PROFESSIONAL GROWTH	(112)	does not attend professional meetings		occasionally goes to professional meetings especially when they are of particular interest to her or she is reminded of them or little effort is required		goes out of her way to attend professional meetings in order to support the profession and keep up-to-date with new ideas		.48	.19

all variables .38 (by institution)

All variables .53

SECOND STAGE RATING SCALE

Student Teacher____________________

Cooperating Teacher____________________

College Supervisor____________________

College or University____________________

Date____________________

RATING SCALE FOR THE EVALUATION OF STUDENT TEACHERS IN HOME ECONOMICS

DIRECTIONS: Read the descriptions and write the number (a whole number, no fractions) corresponding to the observed behavior of the student teacher in the box following the descriptions. Use zero when there has been no opportunity to observe a specific behavior. Please fill in the blanks at the top of this page.

NOTE: The abbreviation CT stands for Cooperating Teacher.

Inter-rater reliability[1]	No observation 0	1	2 3 4	5	Rating	Correlation with student teaching grade[2]	Index of Discrim.[3]
.57	1 PERSONAL QUALITIES	(1) lacks enthusiasm	shows moderate enthusiasm	radiates enthusiasm		.63	.31
.34		(2) lacks patience with students; shows annoyance	usually remains patient in dealings with students	displays patience with students		.52	.20
.21		(3) frequently mispronounces words; repeets trite expressions	generally pronounces words correctly; vocabulary is adequate	has correct pronunciation; uses varied vocabulary		.43	.17
.27		(4) becomes upset with suggestions	usually seeks and utilizes suggestions	invites suggestions and implements them		.53	.28
.57***		(5) pitches voice at irritating level	keeps voice at pleasant level most of the time	pitches voice at pleasing level		.56***	.24
.48	2 LESSON PLANNING GENERAL	(6) lacks detailed planning; does not organize lesson; lesson plans are incomplete	does some detailed planning; tends to use general outline rather than detailed plans; organization is usually adequate; lesson plans are usually complete	does detailed planning; organizes content effectively; lesson plans are rarely incomplete		.70***	.31

NOTE: See asterisk explanations on following page.
See footnote explanations on following page.

Explanations of Asterisks

1 N= 61 matching pairs

2 N= 122 graders

3 Upper N= 33; Lower N= 33

* significant items from regression analysis predicting student teaching grade; number indicated step in analysis

** statistically significant difference at .01 level of confidence when Fisher's Z computed between this value and that obtained by item on 112 rating scale

*** ditto at .05 level of confidence

reliab.	No observation 0	1	2 3	4 5	Rating	r/STG	D
.64	6*	(7) overlcoks pre-planning for time organization and/or makes unrealistic estimate of time needed for each activity	establishes a time plan for lesson but it is not always satisfactory	adequately pre-plans general timing of lesson parts		.72	.33
.41	2b LESSON PLANNING OBJECTIVES	(8) is not concerned with objectives or is concerned with her objectives and with imposing them on students	objectives are comprehensive but are not always important nor stated in student behavioral terms	objectives are important and comprehensive and expressed in student behavioral terms		.69***	.28
.57	2c LESSON PLANNING PREPARATION OF QUESTIONS	(9) does not plan lead-in questions to lesson	plans questions to involve students in learning	plans well thought through questions to motivate student discussion		.67***	.31
.49	2d LESSON PLANNING LEARNING EXPERIENCES	(10) plans too many experiences to fit into period or only one; learning experience often does not develop concept in depth	utilizes a few learning experiences; choice of experience not always appropriate	plans a variety of experiences by which learning can be achieved		.67	.25

reliab.	No observation 0	1	2	3	4	5	Rating	r/STG	D
.42		(11) plans to have students involved in only one activity during class or cannot move students along so that activity can be changed		usually plans activities of varying nature to change pace during class period		recognizes and plans for a change of pace during a class		.64	.30
.33		(12) considers general learning experiences not details plans activities that have little relationship to each other		plans learning experiences that usually increase from the simple to the complex and broad		thoroughly plans each learning experience and each builds on the former		.69	.31
.30		(13) constructs haphazard evaluation devices; on paper and pencil tests uses "recall" type items exclusively		plans evaluative techniques carefully but some inadequacies emerge		evaluation procedures are carefully thought through and measure student growth adequately		.60	.25
.50	3a USE OF 2* MOTIVATION/ INTEREST APPROACH	(14) does not provide any motivation at beginning of period or attempts at motivation fail; does not gain attention and cooperation of students		commonly utilizes an interest approach which tends to be ordinary; occasionally exhibits creative effort in motivation; has some success motivating students		provides initial stimulus that is creative and pertinent to the topic; captures student attention and interest		.74	.31

reliab.	No observation 0	1	2	3	4	5	Rating	r/STG	D
.47		(15) threatens students in an attempt to motivate them; does not expect student self motivation		provides initial and occasional stimuli thereafter to motivate students; occasionally allows students to put their ideas into action		provides continual stimuli during class to motivate students and encourage them to carry through their own ideas		.70	.30
.50		(16) is insensitive to students' needs		is aware of students' most obvious needs		is alert to students' needs; gives incentive to individual pupils having difficulty with the work		.61	.27
.43	3b STRUCTURING OF SUBJECT MATTER	(17) presents skimpy content; does not develop generalizations or attempts to develop too many; does not emphasize important points; superficial development of subject		usually presents adequate content for period; does not always develop generalizations to their fullest		lesson is comprehensive; focuses on a few generalizations which are developed in depth		.68	.24
.39		(18) exhibits concern over subject matter but not whether students understand it; does not clarify points		attempts largely by repetition to explain content that students do not comprehend		when content is not understood, goes over it again in a different way; clarifies statements		.69	.28

reliab.	No observation 0		1	2	3	4	5	Rating	r/STG	D
.36		(19)	does not interrelate parts of lesson or lessons		attempts to point out relatedness or content but this is sometimes unclear		shows relationship between parts of lesson and lessons		.70	.28
.35	7*	(20)	unconcerned about familiarizing herself with subject about which she knows little		makes an attempt to search out information to teach unfamiliar subjects		conscientiously prepares self to teach unfamiliar material by reading, visits, observations		.67	.23
.35		(21)	bluffs way through answers to questions she does not know; ignores questions; changes subject		admits lack of knowledge but neglects to find answer		admits lack of knowledge when questioned on a specific point she does not know; uses resources to answer		.60	.21
.48	3c TECHNIQUES AND METHODS	(22)	plans and/or changes method little or not at all during period or plans too many activities to fit into period; or cannot move students along so that activity can be changed; individual activities incongruent w/respect to total		plans and utilizes a few meaningful learning experiences during a period; choice of experience not always the best; provides different kinds of activities for change of pace		plans and provides varied, meaningful activities to develop principles presented; provides change of pace during period		.66	.22

reliab.	No observation 0	1	2 3	4 5	Rating	r/STG	D
.41		(23) materials are neither handy nor arranged in good order	has the minimum number of materials on hand or prepares them as they are needed during class	has necessary and appropriate materials readily available		.66	.27
.41	3d APPLICATION	(24) does not attempt to provide enough prior information or experience; students are not likely to transfer ideas and practices to the home	occasionally provides experiences in the classroom that can be carried over	provides realistic learning experiences so that students can actively transfer learnings		.68**	.28
.62	3e QUESTIONS	(25) asks vague questions; minor not "meaty" ones; does not utilize lead-in questions or confines questions to items of fact students may remember	utilizes some stimulating and some dull questions, some require more teacher development	has lead, thought provoking, suitable to the lesson questions ready to ask		.67	.28
.62**	4 STUDENT INVOLVEMENT	(26) fails to plan with students or plan far enough with students; does not involve students	occasionally includes students in planning	uses teacher-pupil planning when appropriate - most advantageous to student learning		.65***	.29

reliab.	No observation 0	1	2	3	4	5	Rating	r/STG	D
.54	5a CLASSROOM TIME	(27) lesson too fast moving and material covered too slow moving and interest waning		paces lesson at adequate rate of speed		has excellent sense of pace or tempo in the lesson		.69	.31
.68	5b STUDENT 1* TEACHER WORK EN TOTO	(28) requests less or is unable to assume full teaching load		adequately assumes the classes allocated to her		fully assumes the teaching load assigned to her; may go beyond expected assignment		.75**	.36
.45	6 CLASSROOM CONTROL	(29) permits students without work to do whatever they like which usually disrupts class		does not always have assignments planned for students without any work		has assignments ready for those temporarily out of work or not prepared to do the assignment		.58	.20
.35	7 CARE OF THE DEPARTMENT	(30) has not established nor accepted a routine for care of the department; does not allow sufficient time for clean-up at the end of the period; neglects to check room and equipment at the end of the period		accepts unquestioningly pre-established routine for care of the department; tries to follow plans but occasionally forgets to reserve time for clean-up and supervision of process		has established a routine for care of the department; follow plans; sets aside definite amount of time at end of period for clean-up; checks room and equipment at end of period		.54***	.22

reliab.	No observation 0	1	2	3	4	5	Rating	r/STG	D
.53	8a RAPPORT WITH 3* COOPERATING TEACHER	(31) relies excessively on CT as cannot or will not make own decisions; or ignores suggestions of CT		thinks through some problems but tends to consult CT occasionally when capable of making decisions herself		consults CT for advice after considering possible solution to difficult or unusual problem; makes and abides by decisions within her jurisdiction		.68	.34
.37	8b RAPPORT WITH STUDENTS	(32) students are afraid to speak out in class; appears unapproachable		tries to engender in students a feeling of her approachability and her interest in then		makes students feel at ease with her; some may even bring their problems to her		.64	.30
.49		(33) students seek advice of CT as they do not have faith in the correctness of student teacher's statements, directions		students usually take her word but occasionally seek verification from CT		students accept her as a knowledgeable teacher and follow her suggestions		.65	.30
.45	9 EXTRA CURRICULAR ACTIVITIES	(34) is concerned exclusively with classroom activity or helps others in the school to a limited extent		recognizes some of the extra curricular activities that need to be done; offers and assists with some of these; participates sometimes in community activities and programs		realizes that there are many tasks to be done in a school outside the classroom and willingly helps whether it is her specific responsibility or not; exhibits interest in and takes part in community activities and programs		.47	.28

reliab.	No observation 0	1	2 3	4 5	Rating	r/STG	D
.47	10 PROFES-SIONAL ATTITUDE	(35) sometimes degrades the home economics program	does not "talk up" the home economics program to others; occasionally speaks of the program when others bring up the topic	uses opportunities to present the home economics program to others		.50	.23

EXPERIMENTAL PART

No observation

0	1	2 3	4 5	Rating	D
EVALUATION	(36) gives same test for make-up purposes; make-up test is either too hard or too easy in relation to original; omits make-up tests	prepares a make-up test not adequately different from the original	constructs a different but similar test for students who have been absent		.09
CLASSROOM TIME	(37) seems prepared with nothing else when planned activity does not fill class time	sometimes has another activity ready when time plans are exhausted before expected	can extend plans to utilize class time effectively if the time plan is executed before class ends		.32
RAPPORT WITH FACULTY	(38) has trouble relating well to other faculty members	interacts socially with some of the faculty	is easily accepted by the faculty as one of them		.26
RAPPORT WITH PARENTS	(39) ignores situations where parents are in attendance; ill at ease with parents; unable to communicate concerning student problems	is hesitant about utilizing opportunities to meet parents but occasionally does; attempts explanation of home economics and student problems	takes advantage of opportunities to meet with parents; explains home economics and problems students might have		.27

Your Name______________________________
Student Teacher's Name_________________
Institution____________________________

COLLEGE SUPERVISOR AND COOPERATING TEACHER OPINIONNAIRE ABOUT THE RATING SCALE

Please place an "X" in the appropriate blanks.

I The length of time required to fill out this rating scale was

5, 39* ______ 1. 10 minutes or less
47, 21 ______ 2. 11-20 minutes
23, 18 ______ 3. 21-30 minutes
16, 3 ______ 4. 31-40 minutes
2, 0 ______ 5. 41-50 minutes
2, 1 ______ 6. 51 minutes - 1 hour
3, 0 ______ 7. more than 1 hour

II Regarding the amount of time required to fill out the instrument, I

93, 74 ______ 1. have no objection to the amount of time used.
5, 6 ______ 2. feel that the scale is too time consuming.

III What was the reaction of this student teacher to filling out her scale? (Do not inquire, but student teacher may have made some comments voluntarily.)

16, 47 ______ 1. I don't know
38, 13 ______ 2. As far as I know she took it in stride and completed it.
0, 2 ______ 3. She said that she wasn't going to do it.
27, 15 ______ 4. She was agreeable about helping with the research.
1, 0 ______ 5. She complained about the time involved.
9, 2 ______ 6. Other--please explain__________
____

IV What kind of instrument do you presently use for evaluating a student teacher's performance?

0, 9 ______ 1. none
48, 43 ______ 2. rating scale with descriptive categories like this one
22, 1 ______ 3. rating scale with descriptive adjectives, like superior, good, poor
10, 3 ______ 4. check list
18, 27 ______ 5. other--please specify__________

*first number indicates frequency of CT response to item; second number indicates frequency of CS response

V If you use an instrument to evaluate your student teachers, how does it compare with this rating scale?

Which instrument requires a shorter length of time to complete?

22, 11 ______ 1. the one we are presently using
23, 25 ______ 2. this rating scale
51, 35 ______ 3. both require about the same amount of time

Which instrument is easier to use?

26, 15 ______ 1. the one we are presently using
35, 28 ______ 2. this rating scale
36, 28 ______ 3. both are equally easy to use

Which instrument provides a better basis for grading the student teacher?

11, 6 ______ 1. the one we are presently using
53, 34 ______ 2. this rating scale
34, 29 ______ 3. both provide the same basis

Which instrument is better--all things considered?

17, 8 ______ 1. the one we are presently using
45, 33 ______ 2. this rating scale
35, 22 ______ 3. both are of the same quality

VI If this scale were available for your continued use, would you use it?

67, 52 ______ 1. Yes
7, 6 ______ 2. No
24, 24 ______ 3. Perhaps--please state qualification ______________________________

PLEASE FEEL FREE TO MAKE COMMENTS ABOUT THE RATING SCALE ON THE OTHER SIDE OF THIS SHEET.

****

If you were going to rate this student teacher independently, what number grade would you give her using the following scale: Please write that number on the line.________

90-100	superior
80-89	better than average
70-79	average
60-69	poor
below 60	failure

****

NOTE: If you supervise more than one student teacher, it is not necessary to fill out the complete form for each one. Fill out the entire opinionnaire for the first student teacher and the top of the sheet and items 1, 2, and 3 and the last item regarding the grade for subsequent student teachers.

Name______________________________
Institution________________________

STUDENT TEACHER OPINIONNAIRE ABOUT THE RATING SCALE

Please place an "X" in the appropriate blanks.

I The length of time required to fill out this rating scale was

10* ______ 1. 10 minutes or less
49 ______ 2. 11-20 minutes
21 ______ 3. 21-30 minutes
4 ______ 4. 31-40 minutes
2 ______ 5. 41-50 minutes
3 ______ 6. 51 minutes - 1 hour
0 ______ 7. more than 1 hour

II Regarding the amount of time required to fill out the instrument, I

87 ______ 1. have no objections to the amount of time used.
2 ______ 2. feel that the scale is too time consuming.

III My feeling toward evaluating myself using this rating scale was

positive because	negative because
75 ______ it gave me an objective basis for looking at my performance	8 ______ I hate to rate myself on anything
26 ______ it seemed important professionally	2 ______ it seemed unimportant
23 ______ I could do it quite quickly	2 ______ it took so much time

IV Although your cooperating teacher and college supervisor did not see the ratings you made on yourself, would you have been willing to rate yourself if they had looked at your self evaluation?

87 ______ Yes
2 ______ No

PLEASE FEEL FREE TO MAKE COMMENTS ABOUT THE RATING SCALE BELOW AND/OR ON THE OTHER SIDE OF THIS SHEET.

* number indicates frequency of ST response to item

INFORMATION DESIGNED TO ACCOMPANY RATING SCALE IN FUTURE USE

Development of the rating scale: The items in this rating scale were based on 958 critical behaviors of student teachers reported independently by college supervisors, cooperating teachers, and student teachers. The critical behaviors were then categorized and utilized in constructing a first rating scale which consisted of 112 unidimensional items. The instrument was used independently by the three groups at the conclusion of student teaching. Three hundred and ninety-nine usable scales were returned and analyzed statistically. The major analysis sought to determine which items would significantly predict the student teaching grade; 35 items emerged from this analysis. These items then constituted the second stage rating scale; and the instrument was administered to a second sample. Two hundred and seventy-six rating scales were returned. Cross validation was quite satisfactory; some of the results of analysis of the 35 items scale arenas follows:

split-half reliability	.96
inter-rater reliability (college supervisor and cooperating teacher)	.65
validity coefficient (multiple correlation of 35 items and adjusted student teaching grades [to control for institutional variation])	.78
ditto with student teaching grade as given	.73
correlation of summed scale scores with adjusted student teaching grade	.84
ditto with student teaching grade as given	.79
time to complete the insturment: less than 20 minutes	64% of participants

For further information on the instrument, see Gritzmacher, Joan E. "Evaluation of Student Teaching in Home Economics", Ph.D. Dissertation, Ithaca, New York: Cornell University, 1967.